

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXIX

JULY 1934

Number 3

PAUL SHOREY

1857-1934

PAUL SHOREY was born in Davenport, Iowa, on August 3, 1857. The family moved to Chicago where he had his early education. In 1878 he was graduated from Harvard University, after which he studied law in his father's office in Chicago, being admitted to the bar in 1880. But the practice of law had little appeal and he soon went to Germany where, after studying at various universities, he took his doctorate at Munich in 1884. His Doctor's dissertation, *De Platonis idearum doctrina atque mentis humanae notionibus commentatio*, was the first product of an enthusiasm and study which later carried him to the position of world-authority on Plato. After his return to this country he taught philosophy and Latin at Bryn Mawr College from 1885 to 1892. These years at Bryn Mawr were a period of preparation, a period of reading and absorption. A reminder of his interest in his work there and of what these years had meant to him is his dedication of his edition of Horace to the alumnae of Bryn Mawr College, 1889-95.

When the University of Chicago was founded in 1892, the president of the new institution, William Rainey Harper, gathered together a group of brilliant scholars to form the first faculty. Among them was Shorey, called to a professorship of Greek. Soon afterward in 1895 he married one of his graduate students, Miss Emma Gilbert, who had come to the new institution as fellow in Latin. At the University of Chicago, Shorey continued to pursue his research and to teach almost until the time of his death on April 24, 1934. He was technically re-

tired in 1927, but continued to teach half-time through the summer session of 1933. He gave several public lectures during the autumn, the last a sermon in the University Chapel on December 10, only twelve days before the first slight stroke of paralysis. Even after that he was able to resume his studies to some extent.

Shorey was a genius. Classmates of his at the old Chicago High School give assurance that he was recognized as such even in his high-school days. But at the same time he had a normal healthy boy's interest in life and never was too busy to enter into school activities. The rapidity of his learning was amazing, and he had a prodigious memory which was, to a great degree, selective, that is, he did not remember because he could not forget, but his mind held tenaciously whatever he wished to remember. A quick mastery of languages was always characteristic of him. He learned French in childhood and his interest in this language always remained with him. He steeped himself in French literature as well as in English, Greek, and Latin, and he handled the French language with ease. He reviewed ably not only books in the aforementioned languages, but also books in Swedish, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish. Greek was to him like a modern language. He understood it when it was read aloud to him as easily as he understood English.

It is probably as a teacher that Shorey will be remembered best by the many students who attended his classes. He loved to teach and he was a thrilling and inspiring teacher. His diversity of intellectual interests, his brilliant wit, his wealth of erudition, his lovable ness, and his intensely human quality all combined to make his classes a continual delight and all too short. The copious illustration of passages from classical authors by passages from all literatures which is so well exemplified in his Horace was a constant feature of his teaching. He believed that a language to be understood and appreciated must be heard. Some of the finest hours in his classroom were those during which he read aloud the hexameters of Homer, the lyrics of the dramatists, or passages from the lyric poets. He had a fine voice and a marvelous sense of rhythm. The beauty and grace and feeling of his reading cannot be described.

Shorey's dissertation was soon followed by other studies in Plato, which appeared in the form of articles in various periodicals, "The Interpretation of the *Timaeus*," "The Idea of Justice in Plato's *Repub-*

lic," "The Idea of Good in Plato's *Republic*." But his reputation as a Platonic scholar is solidly based upon his *Unity of Plato's Thought*, published in the "Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago" in 1903. Because it was issued in a cumbersome quarto volume containing ten other articles and monographs devoted to Greek, Latin, comparative philology, and classical archaeology, its circulation was sadly limited. However, Platonic scholars everywhere welcomed it. A French critic pronounced it a definitive work on Plato. Aside from his work on Plato, he contributed articles to learned journals on a bewildering variety of subjects. Among them may be mentioned "The Origin of the Syllogism," "On the Implied Ethics and Psychology of Thucydides," "On δέ γε in Retort," "Choriambic Dimeter and the Rehabilitation of the Antispast," "Illogical Idiom," "The Study of Greek Literature," "Aristotle's *De anima*," "The Issue in Greek Metric," "A Greek Analogue of the Romance Adverb." Further proof of the range of his scholarship may be found in the titles of the fifty-odd doctoral dissertations which he suggested and supervised.

During the twenty-five years of his editorship of *Classical Philology* no number appeared without some contribution from him. There were either articles, or notes comprising lucid, brief, and convincing interpretations of vexed passages in Greek and Latin authors. Perhaps even more striking were the number and variety of the books which he reviewed in each issue of the journal. He was pre-eminent as a critical scholar. He was ever impatient of erroneous interpretations of Greek and of conclusions based upon inadequate evidence.

In this country Shorey's reputation as a Hellenist began with his classroom instruction. Later, as his students went forth to leading institutions of learning in this country and in Canada, they spread the knowledge that there was a great scholar in our midst. Soon he was in constant demand for addresses and lectures of all kinds. In such monographs as *The Assault on Humanism* and *The Case for the Classics* he did much for the cause of cultural studies. Yet his lectures far and near did even more by displaying to audiences the finest product of a mind nurtured in classical studies.

Abundant evidence of his national standing as a scholar and lecturer of distinction is furnished by the eleven honorary degrees which he received and his tenure of many lectureships. Among these lectureships were the Harris Lectures at Northwestern University, the Turnbull

Lectures on Poetry at Johns Hopkins University, the Sather Lectures in the University of California, and the Lowell Lectures in Boston. In 1901-2 he served as director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. He became a member of the American Institute of Arts and Letters and of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. Abroad he was equally honored. In 1913 he was Roosevelt Exchange Professor in Berlin, where he lectured in German on phases of American culture, and conducted a seminar in Aristotle's *De anima*. In 1924 he lectured on Aristotle in four Belgian universities and was awarded the rare distinction of an honorary degree from the University of Liège. From Belgium he went to Paris where he delivered in French an amazing lecture on the rôle of philosophy in French literature which would have done credit to any professor of French literature. He was honored also by foreign academies, being made associé de l'Académie Royale de Belgique in 1929.

In spite of such varied interests and activities he continued to devote himself to the study of Plato and gathered material for two substantial volumes. The first volume, entitled *What Plato Said*, appeared in 1933. It is an exposition for both scholars and laymen of all the writings of Plato. It is furnished with abundant cross-references, notes, and bibliography. The second volume was to contain a thorough revision and expansion of *The Unity of Plato's Thought*. Fortunately the second volume of his translation of Plato's *Republic* in the Loeb Library, of which the first volume appeared in 1930, is actually in press and will appear in due time.

Upon the death of Paul Shorey his colleagues, students, and friends might well express themselves in the words which Phaedo used to express the feelings of Socrates' associates upon his death:

ἢδε ἡ τελευτή, ὁ Ἐχέκρατες, τοῦ ἐτοίρου ἡμῶν ἐγένετο ἀνδρός, ὡς ἡμεῖς φαῖμεν
αὐ, τῶν τότε ὧν ἐπειράθημεν ἀρίστου καὶ ἀλλως φρονιμωτάτου καὶ δικαιοτάτου.

PAUL SHOREY—THE TEACHER¹

It is one of the great things of my life that I am one of Paul Shorey's students and it is the most precious honor that can come to me, sad though it be, that I am here today to speak for his students—to ex-

¹ Delivered at the services for Mr. Shorey in Bond Chapel, University of Chicago, April 27, 1934.

press as simply as I can the veneration in which we hold our teacher, the affection we have for our friend, and our grief that fate must set a term even to such a life as his.

O heart of gold, grown suddenly cold,
It was not time to go.

I have known Dr. Shorey for almost forty years. Perhaps I know him better than most. I must speak out of my own experience, but I am sure that in doing so I shall voice the feeling and the thought of his many students who all over this continent are bearing, each in his own way, the torch which was lit at the flame of his mind and spirit.

It has been my fortune to sit under many distinguished scholars and lecturers both in our own country and abroad, and I detract nothing from them, to whom I owe more than I could express, when I say that Paul Shorey was the greatest teacher I have ever known. He was not one of those who find teaching a perfunctory task or a burdensome thing. Research in the true sense was an effortless habit of his ever growing mind; writing beautiful prose was an unfailing delight; but his greatest joy was in his teaching. It is my impression that he brought to every class or seminar the same deliberate preparation which he put into a review in *Classical Philology* or into a book on Plato. And in no class of his was there a dull moment. Even the halting, stumbling recitations of his students were redeemed by timely flashes of his brilliant mind. A mind that ranged at once sympathetically and exactly over the great expanse of classical culture—nay, over the whole field of humanistic culture, ancient and modern. He dazzled us by the catholicity of his mind, by the wealth of his incidental allusions to the best that had been thought and said in the world, by his incisive comments, and by his sparkling wit.

At first I thought he meant to dazzle us, but I was wrong. He was doing what the great teacher does. He was relating the subject matter in hand, whether it was a tragedy of Aeschylus, a comedy of Aristophanes, a song of Pindar, or a dialogue of Plato, to the past and present, giving it its due place both as a product and as an influence. And what we students got from Shorey above all was a sense of humanism as a continuing tradition, a sense of the great fellowship of the human spirit through the ages. "He saw life steadily and saw it whole."

Naturally, under such an exemplar we were stimulated to put forth our best efforts. But our best seemed very lame in comparison with his genius. Often his sensitive temperament must have flinched at our maladroitness. And yet I never remember to have heard from him in the classroom or out of it a sharp or impatient word regarding any student of his. He spoke in praise or not at all.

We students think of him not only as an intellectual force. He was that in a superlative degree. But he was more than that. He touched our emotions, our tastes, our personalities. He never preached in the classroom, though he could preach. Indeed, most welcome to us were those occasions when, addressing a general public, he set forth his own ideas of life and conduct. I read last night something which Mrs. Shorey gave me, one of the last things he wrote, a lay sermon delivered in the chapel of this University. And a great sermon it is. But what he did in the classroom was what every great teacher does. He transmuted the substance in which he worked in the alembic of his persuasive personality into the stuff of which attitudes of mind and character are made.

I must tell you that we students were a bit afraid of him at first. He seemed remote from us in the quality and degree of his genius. We admired him, as it were, at a distance. It took time for us to realize that in his feeling for his students he was a very human being indeed, and that he craved from us not so much our high respect as our companionship, our fellowship.

I remember well in the days of our early acquaintance going skating with him in Jackson Park. I was pleased and flattered that he should condescend to disport himself with me, but I was not entirely comfortable. I could not adjust myself to a world-authority on Plato skimming over the ice like any boy. In fact, he was, as I later came to know, like any boy. I cannot forget how startled I was when one day he asked me to drop the "Doctor" and the "Professor" and address him as one friend to another. It was very hard to do. It seemed like slapping him on the back, when I felt it appropriate always to be sitting at his feet.

In time this feeling wore away, and now the thing which stands out in him to me is his warm humanness, his interest in the little things that make up the bulk of human life, in small talk, in the routine of

familiar things—in a word, his “everyday” companionship and friendship.

His competent scholarship is known and valued wherever in the world scholarship is respected. His extraordinary mastery of expression is appreciated by cultivated readers of English prose everywhere. But his quality as a teacher and a friend we whom he taught and befriended know best.

I have inadvertently spoken of him in the past tense. But this service does not mark the end of a life. He was, and is, and will continue to be to us all a living presence.

To her who was a devoted student, then his devoted wife, we, her fellow-students, tender our sympathy and our affection. Her own hallowed grief no one may share, but, in a sense, we are all united in the fellowship of a common sorrow. God bless her and help us all!

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

CLASSES AND MASSES IN HOMER. I

BY GEORGE M. CALHOUN

IN THE view from the wall, Priam, struck by the regal bearing of Agamemnon, asks Helen to say who he is. Helen answers in two lines:

οὐτός γ' Ἀτρείδης εὑρὺν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων,
ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής [Γ 178 f.].

In the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus replies to the tactful questions of Alcinous, he proclaims his identity in two lines which are unrivaled for proud simplicity:

εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Δαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισι
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει [ι 19 f.].

These passages are typically Homeric in the restraint with which a few words are made to suggest much. They are also, to my thinking, typical of the poet's interest in men as individuals, in their personal qualities and capacities, in what they are and what they do. This preoccupation with particular human beings, rather than with genealogies and pedigrees, impresses itself distinctly upon the reader who has the point in mind. For a number of reasons it is somewhat surprising. A wealth of genealogical material was at hand in heroic legend; it was eminently suitable for the adornment and variation of the recital and well adapted to the stately epic style. We should expect to find it used in abundance and elaborated at every opportunity. Yet in actual fact it is kept very definitely within bounds, and the emphasis, as has been said, is rather upon individuals and their personal qualities. This has always seemed to me not entirely compatible with the opinion that the society in which the poet found his background was composed of a plebeian mass dominated by a nobility of birth. And in reading the poems with particular regard to these problems, I have been impressed with some notable peculiarities in uses and meanings of words. In several instances these extend to the omission of entire groups of related terms—omissions so significant in the aggregate that theories which fail to explain them must be

considered definitely inadequate. Yet, so far as I can find, these peculiarities have not been observed, much less explained.¹

Adolf Fanta's monograph, *Der Staat in der Ilias und Odyssee* (Innsbruck, 1882), is still, after more than fifty years, the stock reference on the Homeric nobility, and its principal conclusions have very largely determined orthodox opinion.² It has been subjected to but little modification or examination, except as regards the powers and position of the Homeric king. Here Finsler's able exposition of the theory that the poems reflect the aristocratic constitution of the Ionian cities in the early historical age³ has been challenged by those who find in Homer evidence for a monarchy commensurate in power and splendor with the Mycenaean palaces and tombs, or with the hypothetical Great Achaean Empire of the Hittite tablets.⁴ All this has kept alive a vigorous controversy and led to frequent re-examination of the poems. With this controversy I am not now immediately concerned, but it seems desirable to point out that we still await an objective appraisal of the literary evidence; each of these studies finds its start-

¹ I refer to the use of the poems as sources; the facts are noted here and there in commentaries and lexicons; they are known philologically but not historically. On a somewhat similar situation with regard to the formal epithet, cf. *infra*, n. 10.

² One point of view will emphasize the position of the king (G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde*, Part I [Munich, 1920], pp. 317 ff.; M. P. Nilsson, "Das homerische Königtum," *Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad.*, VII [1927], 23 ff., *Homer and Mycenae* [London, 1933], pp. 212 ff.), another the power of the nobility (G. Finsler, "Das homerische Königtum," *N. Jahrh. Kl. Alt.*, XVII [1906], 313 ff., 393 ff.), and another the importance of the commons (C.-W. Westrup, *Le roi de l'Odyssée et le peuple chez Homère* [Paris, 1930]), but the fundamental assumptions defended by Fanta are either stated or implied in most accounts of Homeric society. British scholars as a rule tend to greater caution in the use of "noble" and "nobility," and Zimmern observes, in *The Greek Commonwealth* (4th ed. Oxford, 1924), p. 91: "The truth is that, in mainland Greece at any rate, there was no such wide separation as the epic tale leads our Northern imagination to suppose between the nobles and the people." Grote, in his chapter (xx) on "The State of Society and Manners as Exhibited in Grecian Legend," comes nearer to the truth than many of his successors. Bury gives a fair statement of the prevailing view in *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great* (London, 1904), p. 71: "But we must take it for granted, as an ultimate fact, which we have not the means of explaining, that certain families had come to hold a privileged position above the others—had, in fact, been marked out as noble, and claimed descent from Zeus; and the Council was composed of this nobility." For the literature of the subject, cf. Busolt, *loc. cit.*; E. Drerup, *Homeric Poetik*, I (Würzburg, 1921), 143 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*; accepted in the main by P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (Leipzig, 1923), p. 349.

⁴ W. Leaf, *Homer and History* (London, 1915), pp. 193 ff.; Nilsson, "Königtum" pp. 23 ff.; *Mycenae*, pp. 212 f.

ing-point in a theory based on external facts whose connection with the poems is yet to be established. To take the connection for granted is to beg the question, and an inevitable result is the mass of contradictory opinion with which the student of Homer is only too familiar.

Despite the vitality and relative immunity from criticism that hypotheses attain when once they are intrenched in the pages of histories and handbooks, it is really surprising that Fanta's main conclusions have gone unchallenged for so many years. Not only was his study made at a time when Homeric scholarship was completely dominated by theories long since abandoned, but it was admittedly an *ex parte* search for evidence to confirm those theories.⁵ It is based as regards the *Iliad* on Lachmann, and as regards the *Odyssey* on Kirchhoff, and when facts prove recalcitrant they are forced into line by arguments *ad hoc*. For example, when the "oldest" use of $\dot{\eta}\rho\omega\varsigma$ is met three times, most inconveniently, in the "latest" parts of the *Odyssey*, two instances are found to be copied from the "older" *lieder* of the *Iliad*, and the third is attributed to the archaizing habit of a seventh-century poet.⁶ Even more serious than this sort of juggling with the sources is the weakness of a method which practically ignores the poet's literary and metrical technique, and treats the text as a mere mass of data to be tabulated—a procedure not unlike that of the earlier excavators, with fortunately the notable difference that Fanta's excavations could not obliterate the evidence or spoil the ground for his successors. For example, much is made of a difference between the use of $\dot{\eta}\rho\chi\alpha\mu\varsigma$ with $\dot{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omega\varsigma$ and with $\lambda\alpha\omega\varsigma$; the former title might be given to almost anyone, while the latter, we are solemnly assured, is restricted to Simon-pure kings, $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\gamma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$.⁷ Yet anyone who will

⁵ Explicitly stated in both Preface and Introduction.

⁶ P. 17. Finsler (p. 332) would exactly reverse the order.

⁷ Pp. 30 ff. Fanta makes some allowance for *poetische Bedeutung* in epithets, but fails to observe the constant control of metrical form upon the choice of epithets and their distribution. Cf. Milman Parry, *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris, 1928), esp. pp. 104 ff.; this supersedes all earlier studies. Finsler's discussion of various terms, mainly epithets (pp. 330 ff.), would be more valuable did it not involve certain premises which are either false or questionable. (1) He tacitly assumes that the choice of epithets is determined primarily by their meanings and that the primary purpose is to convey information (e.g., the observations on $\dot{\alpha}\mu\pi\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ and $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ [pp. 325-26]). (2) He forgets that many apparent differences of usage between the two poems are simply the results of applying the conventional vocabulary of ornamental epithet to very different sets of characters. If one were to throw a stone in the *Iliad*, he would almost certainly

glance at the passages in which the expressions occur will not need Parry's studies of the epithet to discover that the formula with *λαῶν* is merely the vocative of the formula with *ἀνδρῶν*; the poet could not speak of anyone, king or commoner, as *ὅρχαμος λαῶν*, nor to anyone as *ὅρχαμε ἀνδρῶν*, without making bad verse.

The present inquiry has to do primarily with Fanta's belief that the poems describe a society which has definitely crystallized into classes, and, more particularly, that there was a nobility of birth, *ἀριστῆς, ἀριστοί, ἀγαθοί*, sharply set apart by divine descent from the mass of the folk, the *κακοί* or the *χέροις*.⁸ It is not surprising that this belief has found so general acceptance, for such societies are the rule, not the exception, in the history of the Western world, save in those instances where the fiat of modern democracy has intervened. Moreover, it accords perfectly, not only with Finsler's *Adelssaat*, but also with the views of his principal opponents. It fits neatly into Leaf's picture of an Achaean "dominant class" ruling over a Pelasgian population, and equally well into Nilsson's Great Achaean Kingdom ruled by a Myceenaean King of Kings with serried ranks of vassals and retainers.⁹ It seems really a pity to throw doubt upon such a very cothurnus among theories, which suits so conveniently reconstructions so diverse. But I must confess that I find in Homer very little to support it, and in particular I am struck by a circumstance which others seem not to have noticed—the complete omission from the poems of the specific words for nobility of birth and for distinctions based on descent that are so abundant in the writings of later ages. To me this seems significant.

hit a king or major hero; in the *Odyssey*, unless his aim were exceedingly accurate, he could only hope to bag a petty king at best, and might find that he had brought down a swineherd. (3) Finsler starts by assuming that the words he is studying refer to a nobility (e.g., p. 313: "nicht vom König ausgeübt, sondern vom Adel"; pp. 330: "ἀπορέονται, sich hervortun, ihren Adel beweisen"), and it never occurs to him to ask whether in fact they constitute proof of a nobility. These and like errors are not uncommon in studies of Homeric society.

⁸ Pp. 12 ff., esp. pp. 13 and 16. I start from Fanta's monograph, rather than any of the more recent studies, because it cites more fully the passages on which the opinions under examination may be supposed to rest, and because it is so constantly given as a reference. In the later studies the material is usually selected with reference to more specialized problems.

⁹ Leaf, pp. 54 ff.; Nilsson, *Mycenae*, pp. 229 ff.

Did we find in Homer, in frequent use, specific terms for nobility of birth, we should unquestionably be justified in accepting the a priori assumption that such words as *ἀριστῆς*, *ἀριστοί*, *ἄγαθοί*, and also *κακοί* and *χέρης*, are designations of classes, and have the connotations so familiar from later literature. On the other hand, if we note a conspicuous absence of the specific terms, we must question the validity of any such assumption, and must conclude that the social concepts of Homer are more sharply separated from those of the historic period than has been hitherto allowed. As a corollary, we must entertain the possibility that the words which later became quasi-technical terms for classes have not yet developed their special connotations, and are used primarily in actual description of the qualities and attributes of individuals.

Furthermore, if we are to avoid a type of error which too often invalidates the arguments of Fanta and of others, we must decline to rest our conclusions upon the distribution of purely formal epithets or conventional expressions which are no more than epic ornamentation.¹⁰ In abstract principle the formal use of epithet is clearly recognized in every handbook, but in actual use of the poems as sources it is too often neglected.

¹⁰ The epithets used of a particular individual are determined in great measure by the quantities of the syllables in his name, the position of the name in the verse, and the case in which it stands (cf. Parry, pp. 105 ff.). And we have always to allow for seemingly arbitrary habits and preferences; no one would attempt to describe the particular outfits of individual warriors from the poet's use of *κοριθαίολος*, *λείκασπις*, *αιολοθώρηξ*, etc., yet no one hesitates to determine social status and political privilege from epithets which often are allocated in the same arbitrary way (e.g., Fanta, pp. 27 ff.; Finsler, pp. 331 ff.). We might with equal prospect of success attempt to determine the comparative pulchritude of the various women in Homer from the allocations of *καλλίσφυρος*, *εὐχώνος*, etc. Furthermore, when such characters as Philoetius and Eumeus are brought into the narrative they are given the conventional heroic epithets; when the activities of the rank and file are recounted, such expressions as *πολλοί τε καὶ ἄσθοι* are in order; when the folk are addressed, they may be called *ἥρωες*, and even servants may be given the epithets commonly associated with kings and heroes. We need not infer from σ 5 that the beggar Irus has come down in the world, for every mother may be *πότνια μήτηρ* in the epic. All this of course is known, but it seems to be shut off into a water-tight compartment when the poems are used as sources. Considerable progress has lately been made in the study of the epithet from the point of view of epic technique (cf. Parry, chap. iv, pp. 146 ff.), but little or none toward sounder methods of interpretation. In the present state of the problem, it would be an advance in method to adopt the principle that the epithets are valid evidence for the existence of the ideas and the things they denote, but not for attributions to particular individuals or groups. This would at least bring to an end such vain disputations as those which have to do with the *ἀριστερέες βασιλῆς* of θ 390 (Finsler, p. 326), or the meaning of *ιερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοι* in η 167 and elsewhere (cf. Busolt, pp. 322 f.).

The epithet in Homer is so clearly formulary, its use so involved with considerations of meter and technique, that we cannot safely base any inference upon the allocation of particular epithets among individuals. But the sum total of the epithets, taken collectively, yields a fairly clear idea of the various qualities and characteristics that conferred distinction.¹¹ We find many desirable attributes—prowess, wealth, wisdom, power, fame, physique, bravery, esprit, appearance, address, leadership, but not birth per se. To this statement there are two apparent exceptions. The epithet *διογενής* is used of a few heroes, chiefly Odysseus, Ajax, and Patroclus,¹² and occasionally, without a proper name, in polite address; but a thorough study of the word makes it quite clear that its use is conventional and formal and no specific meaning can be stressed. It is merely an item of minor importance in the general group of epithets comprising *διοτρεφής*, *διφιλος*, *δῖος*, *ἀντίθεος*, *θεοειδῆς*, etc., to which we cannot attach any very special significance. The feminine adjective *εὐπατέρεια* is used twice of Helen (Ζ 292; χ 227) and once of the legendary Tyro (λ 235).¹³ Even were it granted for the sake of argument that *διογενής* and *εὐπατέρεια* are used precisely to denote a nobility of birth with divine ancestry, we should still be forced to conclude that noble lineage was of relatively slight importance among the various qualities which conferred distinction. We do not find *εὐγενής*, *γενναῖος*, *γεννήτης*, *εὐπατρίδης*, *εὐπατρις*, *εὐπάτωρ*, or any other of the words which were habitually used in later times to express definitely the idea of noble

¹¹ Parry gives a very complete collection of epithets (pp. 111 ff.).

¹² References in Fanta, p. 33, nn. 1 and 2. When Busolt says that the epithet is not given to *weiteren Kreisen des Adels* (p. 320, n. 2), and Finsler that it *ist nicht auf den Adel übergegangen* (p. 333), we can only wonder on what basis this exclusive inner group was chosen; I would hazard the guess that Eurypylus (Δ 810) was elected on the strength of the patronymic *Εὐαιμονίδης*. Leaf (p. 12, n. 1) declines to see in the word anything more than a "complimentary epithet."

¹³ If Homeric society was dominated by a nobility of birth, and *διογενής* and *εὐπατέρεια* are actually terms for nobility, we should certainly not find them so sporadically used of a mere handful of persons. They have the typical characteristics of the ornamental epithet, and their allocation, in so far as it is not purely arbitrary, seems to be determined mainly by metrical considerations. The sum total of the evidence is that, out of all the epithets with which the poems abound, one, not often used, refers to descent from Zeus, and another, found three times, to a goodly father. So marked a contrast with the rich terminology of noble birth in later literature is instructive. The formula *Διός ἐκγεναῖα*, "daughter of Zeus," is used of Helen and once (ξ 229) of Athena; according to Ebeling, *ἐκγενομαι* refers regularly to sons or daughters and once only to a grandson (Φ 185); on *ἐκγονος*, cf. *in/ra*, p. 198.

birth.¹⁴ Not once are they found in more than twenty-seven thousand verses in Homer, yet they promptly appear in the pitifully few lines that remain from Archilochus (frag. 90 [H.-Cr.]: πάρελθε, γενναῖος γάρ εἰς) and Phocylides (frag. 2 [H.-Cr.]: γένος εὐγενές), and in Theognis in a comparison between mere wealth and birth (183 ff.).

Other curious lacunae seem to point in this same direction. The poems do not contain the antonyms of nobility, δυσγενής, δυσγένεια, ἀγενής, etc., or κακόπατρις, which occurs twice in the lyric fragments (Alcaeus, frag. 42 [H.-Cr.]; Theognis 193). They do not contain the words for ancestors so frequent in later writings, or for descendants. Amid a profusion of terms for the actual relationships between living members of a family, such words as πρόπατος and πρόγονος do not occur—save πρόγονος, once, of early spring lambs (ι 221). Yet in the few lines extant of Callinus we find

οὐ γάρ κως θάνατόν γε φυγεῖν εἰμαρμένον ἔστιν
ἀνδρ', οὐδὲ εἰ προγόνων ἢ γένος ἀθανάτων
[frag. 1.12 f. (H.-Cr.)].

In the one instance where *έκγονος* means “descendant,” not son or daughter, it is marked by *γενεῖν* (ο 225); *ἀπόγονος* is not found, and *γόνος* only rarely (e.g., N 449; Z 191) refers to any but the immediate offspring. The words *συγγενής*, *συγγένεια*, *όμογενής*, etc., so definitely associated with the development of the aristocratic *γένη*, do not occur.¹⁵ All this may, of course, be mere coincidence, but I find it difficult to understand how a poet who had in mind a society dominated by a nobility could have composed so many thousands of lines without once using a single word from these particular groups.

For all Fanta’s insistence upon a sharp division between nobility and commons, he is able to find but few words which he thinks can be taken definitely as *Standesbezeichnungen*, and he cites surprisingly few specific instances. In one place he observes “dass ἀριστεῖς oder ἀριστος und κακός oder das diesem entsprechende χέρης die einzigen Bezeichnungen sind, durch welche Adel und Gemeine unterschieden

¹⁴ For *ένηγενής*, found in the vulgate, Λ 427 and Ψ 81, the correct reading is *ένηφενής* (cf. Leaf, note to Λ 427; Allen, *Ilias, app. crit.*); *γενναῖον* (neuter) is found once (Ε 253) in the sense “innate.”

¹⁵ This adds a weighty bit of testimony in favor of the view that the *γένη* were of comparatively late origin; for an excellent review of the controversy, cf. W. S. Ferguson, “The Athenian Phratries,” *Class. Phil.*, V (1910), 257 ff., esp. p. 278.

werden." But he starts with the rather sweeping assertion, "Ueberall in der Ilias und Odyssee wird ein über die Masse des Volkes sich erhebender Adel vorausgesetzt, der als der Stand der ἀριστῆς, ἀριστοῦ oder ἀγαθοῖ bezeichnet wird." To substantiate this assertion he cites a baker's dozen of passages, some of them of doubtful pertinence.¹⁶ The few which appear really to support his hypothesis may best be considered in connection with the general Homeric uses and meanings of the words in question.

'*Αριστέρ*' is used sparingly, and normally implies a very special pre-eminence. Champions who volunteer or are picked for single combat, or the hazardous service of the *λόχος*, are *ἀριστῆς*.¹⁷ The members of Agamemnon's council are occasionally called either *ἀριστῆς Παναχαιῶν* or *ἀριστήσσιν Ἀχαιῶν* as the meter requires; they are few in number and individually are entitled as champions to be called *ἀριστῆς*.¹⁸ In the singular the word is used to mark the unequaled prowess of Achilles,¹⁹ the peculiar skill of Teucer with the bow,²⁰ and the eminence or prowess, or both, of Odysseus as contrasted with the suitors.²¹ Twice the plural refers to petty kings or chieftains within the *polis*,²²

¹⁶ Nearly all of the ten instances of *ἀριστέρ* cited by Fanta (p. 13, n. 4) are references to the small group of Achaean leaders and champions who made up Agamemnon's council, nine or ten persons at the most. The instances of *ἀριστοῦ* with certain verbs (p. 14, n. 1) will be found under the discussion of that term. Much of value on these and the following words is contained in M. Hoffmann's monograph, *Die ethische Terminologie bei Homer, Hesiod und den alten Elegikern und Jambographen* (Tübingen, 1914); the interpretations, which cannot here be taken up in detail, are in general more objective than are those found in studies of Homeric society, although a nobility of birth is, as usual, taken for granted. Unfortunately I have not been able to see J. Gerlach, 'ANHP 'ΑΓΑΘΟΣ (Munich, 1933).

¹⁷ A 227; H 73, 159, 184; § 218; ω 86 (of the champions who contended for the prizes at the funeral games of Achilles); ο 28 (of the twenty men picked from the suitors to ambush Telemachus; cf. δ 669 ff., 778: *ἐκπίνατ' ἔλκοσι φόρας ἀριστῶν*); here I should put φ 153, 170, since Antinous is referring to prowess; but the interpretation is complicated by the tragic irony. In the sense of "champion" the word is virtually an equivalent of *πρόμον* (e.g., H 116, 136). For Finsler's interpretations, cf. pp. 330 f.

¹⁸ B 404; I 421; H 327 = 385 = Ψ 236. A comparison of these passages with the citations of the preceding note and with K 1, will show how closely related are the two uses with one another and with the primary idea of the verb *ἀριστεῖν* (cf. Z 208 = Λ 784). The champions of H 161 ff. are the councilors of B 404 ff. (except for Nestor), with some recruits from the "junior champions" of T 193 (*κούρητας ἀριστῆς Παναχαιῶν*), 238 ff. (Eurypylus omitted in T, perhaps because of the wound so often spoken of in Λ-II). The poet clearly has in mind a small, select group of particular champions.

¹⁹ P 203. ²⁰ O 489. ²¹ φ 333; ω 460.

²² I 396; § 34. In this sense too the word connotes a very special distinction, within the smaller framework of the *polis*.

in the two instances in which it is used of the suitors,²³ it is, I believe, in the sense first discussed. If nobility of birth is a prerequisite of the title, it is not the only prerequisite or the most important. If the word refers to a noble class, it cannot include that class entire, but only the small minority who enjoy an especial distinction by reason of unusual prowess or eminent leadership. Some appraisal of personal qualities seems to be implied even when the word is used as a formal epithet, and apparently it retains its specific meanings.

Instances of *ἄριστος* abound, and it enters so constantly into formula that its allocation among individuals cannot be stressed. Agamemnon is sometimes called *μέγ' ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν*, and in B 577 ff. his primacy depends upon his formidable military following. Similarly, Eurymachus is *πολλὸν ἄριστος ἀνήρ*, and the Ithacans revere him as a god (ο 519 ff.); Antinous is *μέγ' ἄριστος κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκη* (χ 29 f.).²⁴ But the word is more often used of such outstanding champions as Achilles, Ajax, and Diomede, obviously with reference to their prowess,²⁵ and of the individual who is "best" in some particular activity.²⁶ In the same way the plural occasionally connotes nothing more than high position,²⁷ but more often is used of picked soldiers, or picked crews;²⁸ at times it includes the rank and file as well as the

²³ *Supra*, n. 17.

²⁴ Cf. A 91; B 82; of Zeus T 95, 258; of Apollo T 413; of other gods T 122 f.: *ἄριστοι/ἀθανάτων*, ol δ' *ἄντες ἀνεμώλιοι*; cf. also v 335.

²⁵ Achilles A 244, 412 = Π 274; Ajax B 768; Diomede E 103, 414; cf. Z 7; Φ 279; K 236; Ψ 802.

²⁶ e.g., Teucer, *ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν τοξούνη*, N 313 f.; Calchas, *οἰωνοπόλων δχ' δρίστος*, A 69 (cf. ο 252 f.); Odysseus, *βροτῶν δχ' δρίστος ἀπάντων βούλη καὶ μίθουσιν*, ν 297 f.; of champion athletes, Ψ 669, 891; cf. θ 127. To understand the direct simplicity of the Homeric use, we must note that *δρίστος* and certain of the formulas into which it enters are as freely employed of horses, hogs, and other domestic animals as of heroes and kings; e.g., B 761 ff.; ι 432; § 19, 106, 108; ω 215; cf. the neuter M 344, 357.

²⁷ The only passages I note where *ἄριστος* seems to have merely a general connotation of rank or social status are a few referring to the suitors (e.g., β 51; π 251; ω 429), in which we have epic formula, no more to be stressed than *ἀνέρες ἑσθλοι*, or other like expressions. In the majority of cases there is a distinct connotation of eminent prowess or leadership or both, e.g., K 273, 300, 560; Α 258; N 42, 740, 751; Ο 295 ff.; P 368, 377; Γ 19; H 150, 285; γ 108; ξ 257; Γ 250; Δ 260; Z 435. This is true, I believe, of the instances in which *ἄριστοι* is associated with verbs of leading or ruling (cf. Fanta, p. 14, n. 1), but such stock bits as *πάντες (-as) ἄριστοι (-ous)* are favorite endings for lines, and we must be on our guard against stressing the word unduly.

²⁸ E.g., Z 188; δ 530, 778; ι 195; envoys, I 520; oarsmen, θ 36; dancers, θ 250; the champions in the wooden horse, δ 272, 278; ω 512.

leaders and champions.²⁹ The word is never, to my knowledge, linked with an explicit allusion to birth, and in general describes individuals or groups who may be "best" in a variety of ways.

Several instances of *ἀγαθός* are worth examination.³⁰ The formula *ἀγαθός περ ἐών* is used of Agamemnon (A 275), Achilles (A 131; Ω 53, *ἀγαθῷ περ ἐόντι*), and Zeus (Ο 185; cf. 195, *κρατερός περ ἐών*). Achilles says of himself *πατρὸς δ' εἰμ' ἀγαθοῖο* (Φ 109), and Menelaus of Telemachus *αἰματός εἰς ἀγαθοῖο* (δ 611). The phrase *πατρὸς ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ* occurs in Diomedes's account of his family (Ξ 113; cf. *infra*, p. 207), and is used by Penelope of the pretended Aethon, son of Deucalion (φ 335). The most striking instance certainly is ο 321-24, where Odysseus alludes to personal services, *ολὰ τε τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι παραδρώωσι χέρης*. This does look quite like a juxtaposition of definite classes. Yet the expression might easily refer to such service as a highland chieftain receives from poor second cousins, and there is no suggestion that inferiority or superiority is a matter of birth. These passages are in themselves scarcely decisive one way or the other. They could be taken to refer to a nobility of birth were there other evidence; failing this, they may be understood to describe the status or qualities of individuals. What is most significant, in my opinion, is again the complete absence of the familiar and explicit terms that are constantly linked with *ἀγαθός* in later literature. In order to show what this implies, I cite a few passages (the result not of a search but of a glance at Liddell and Scott, *s.v. ἀγαθός*) from the tragic poets, with whom the idea of a class of nobles or well-born citizens was the most familiar of social concepts. Cf. Soph. *El.* 1081 ff.: *τις ἀν εὐπατρις ὁδε βλάστοι; /οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀγαθῶν τοι/ξῶν κακῶς εἰκλειαν αἰσχῦναι θέλει* (cf. *Ant.* 38: *εἴτ' εὐγενῆς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλῶν κακή*). Fragment 81 (Nauck): *ὅταν οἱ τ' ἀγαθοὶ πρὸς τῶν ἀγενῶν/κατανικῶνται*. Fragment 657 (Nauck): *τοὺς εὐγενεῖς γάρ κάγαθούς, ω παῖ, φιλεῖ/Ἄρης ἐναίρειν*. Eur. *Alc.* 601 f.: *τὸ γάρ εὐγενὲς ἐκφέρεται πρὸς αἰδῶ/ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι δὲ πάντ' ἔνεστιν σοφίας*. *Iph. A.* 625 f.: *ἀνδρὸς γάρ ἀγαθοῦ κῆδος αὐτὸς ἐσθλὸς ὡν/λήψει*,

²⁹ B 577: *δια τῷ γε πολὺ πλείστοι καὶ δριστοί/λαοι ἔποντ*. cf. E 780; M 89, 197.

³⁰ Curiously enough, Fanta (p. 13, n. 4) cites no instance of *ἀγαθός* to support his assertion that the word is *Standesbezeichnung*, though later on, in a discussion of wealth, he refers to two instances of the formula *ἀφρεός τ' ἀγαθός τε* (p. 15, n. 2); to these he might well have added ο 276, *ἀγαθὴν τε γυναῖκα καὶ ἀφνεοῖο θύγατρα*. The various comparatives of *ἀγαθός* will be considered later on.

τὸ τῆς Νηρῆδος ισθθεον γένος. *Andr.* 766 ff.: ἦ μὴ γενοίμαν ἡ πατέρων ἀγαθῶν/εἴην πολυκτήτων τε δόμων μέτοχος./εἴ τι γὰρ πάσχοι τις ἀμήχανον, ἀλλὰς/οὐ σπάνις εὐγενέτας.

A contrast so striking is sufficient evidence that the connotations of *ἀγαθός* for Homer and for the poets of a later time were materially different. In the epic the word seems to refer primarily to individuals, not to classes.³¹ Agamemnon, Achilles, Zeus, must not presume upon their pre-eminence, their prowess or power; good as they are, there are things they must not do. Achilles may quite well be thinking of his father's personal excellence, and Menelaus that the canny words of Telemachus suit the son of Odysseus and grandson of Autolyceus. Unquestionably Diomede has in mind his father's distinguished parentage and brilliant marriage, but also his heroic death, his bountiful wealth, and his surpassing prowess with the spear—all this enters into his goodliness. Penelope remembers that the pretended Aethon is a king's son, and we need not assume a nobility to justify her use of *ἀγαθός*. And if the *ἀγαθοί* receive personal service from their inferiors, this shows a difference of status, but not necessarily a difference of birth or even the existence of well-defined social classes.³² Finally, the individuals in question are in each instance members of kingly families. We have here perhaps the beginnings of the process which evolved a noble class, but that process has not gone far.

The commons, *die Masse des Volkes*, according to Fanta, in contradistinction to the nobles, are designated by two words, *κακοί* and *χέρης*. For *χέρης* as a designation of class, he cites two passages, ο 324, which we have just discussed, and A 80, where Calchas, whom most scholars would probably rank as a "noble," is contrasting his status with that of the mighty Agamemnon, the commander-in-chief. The word is often used to compare individuals in respect of their personal qualities and particularly their prowess in battle.³³

³¹ We must not forget that *ἀγαθός* in the great majority of instances refers simply to prowess in war, and this was unquestionably its primary connotation for the epic poet; cf., e.g., Φ 280, and see Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age* (New York, 1907), p. 446; Hoffmann, p. 72.

³² Ebeling takes the word here to mean "wealthy," not "nobly born"; and the translation of Butcher and Lang, "those offices wherein meaner men serve their betters," is a fair-enough rendering. Hoffmann (p. 72) believes it is *adlig*.

³³ E.g., Δ 400.

For *κακός* eight passages are cited.³⁴ Four of them call for but few words. When Nausicaa says to Odysseus *οὐτε κακῷ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ζούκας* (ξ 187), she is clearly not thinking of his quarterings, and Fanta would probably not have cited the expression had he noted that it is elsewhere addressed to the cowherd Philoetius (v 227). When Hector and Eurymachus are afraid *μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος* (X 106, φ 324), the connotations seem to be prowess and manly qualities rather than lineage. (Nausicaa expresses the same fear in almost the same words, and *κακώτερος*, as she explains, refers to a mean disposition: *μάλα δ' εἰσιν ὑπερφίαλοι κατὰ δῆμον· καὶ νῦ τις ὡδὸς εἴπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας* [ξ 274 f.].) And we have certainly no class-term in *βλήτο γάρ οὐ τι κάκιστος ἀνὴρ μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσιν* (II 570). There remain four passages in which, if taken by themselves, *κακός* and *κακοί* could quite well refer to a class, to the commons, the low-born, in contrast to the kingly class, or, equally well, to individuals who were bad, weak, cowardly, or marked by any other of the defects which *κακός* ordinarily implies—defects incompatible with the poet's conception of a prince. When Ajax has slain Archelochus, son of Antenor, he cries:

οὐ μέν μοι κακὸς εἴδεται οὐδὲ κακῶν ἔξ,
ἀλλὰ καστγνητος Ἀντήνορος ἵπποδάμοιο,
η̄ πάις· αὐτῷ γάρ γενεὴν ἄγχιστα ἔψει [Ξ 472-74].³⁵

Similarly, Menelaus infers from the manners and looks of Telemachus and Pisistratus that they come of kingly houses:

οὐ γάρ σφῶν γε γένος ἀπόλωλε τοκήων,
ἀλλ' ἀνδρῶν γένος ἐστὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλήων
σκηπτούχων, ἐπει οὐ κε κακοὶ τοιούσδε τέκοιεν [δ 62-64].³⁶

³⁴ Fanta, p. 14, n. 2. Finsler does not examine the instances of *κακός*, but proceeds on the assumption that it refers to the commons as opposed to the nobility (p. 334). When Busolt says (p. 211, n. 5), "Im Gegensatze zu den vornehmen Männern heißen schon bei Homer die übrigen Volksgenossen *κακοί*," he is clearly depending entirely on Fanta, since he cites the identical eight passages and the two on *χέρης*. Hoffmann has evidently made an independent study of the word, and cites (pp. 82 ff.) Ξ 126, 472; α 411; θ 553; χ 415; the two last passages are the universal negative in polarized form, which will be discussed later on.

³⁵ The text is uncertain; Aristophanes read *βα φυῆν* instead of *γενεὴν*, and Pap. 10 has *κεφαλὴν*. Leaf (note *ad loc.*) finds the vulgate difficult to understand.

³⁶ Cf. p 415 (cited by Finsler, p. 334) for the same idea.

The suitors are impressed by the distinguished appearance of the supposed Mentes, *οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακῷ εἰς ὥπα ἔρκει* (a 411). Diomede claims the right to be heard in council because, though the youngest, he is born of a goodly sire and a valiant and princely house; the recital of his birth closes with the lines

*τῶ οὐκ ἄν με γένος γε κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα φάντες
μίθον ἀτιμήσαιτε πεφασμένον, ὅν κ' ἐν εἴπω* [Ξ 126 f.]

In none of these passages is the slightest difficulty of interpretation encountered if *κακός* be taken in the ordinary sense it bears in the great majority of Homeric instances. In each we have in effect litotes; here is a man who is no *niddering*, no coward or weakling, nor of such parentage, but of kingly stock. In other words, the members of kingly families are assumed to be, not evil, or cowardly, or weak, or ugly, but good, brave, strong, and beautiful. When we have made allowance for the inevitable contrast between the man of kingly position, bearing, and qualities, and the man who is in all respects his opposite, there is nothing in the four passages to support the received interpretation except the fact that in three of them *κακός* is associated with a reference to parentage or family—that and nothing more. If decisive evidence in favor of Fanta's view can be found, clearly it will lie, not in Homer's use of the word *κακός*, but in the references to birth. These cannot be adequately understood without taking into account what the poet has to say elsewhere on this subject.

If noble lineage and divine descent were the fundamental criterion of social and political distinction in Homeric society, we should expect to find much attention paid to these subjects in the poems and many notable genealogical passages. At the start of our inquiry we noted the abundance of material available and its potential usefulness, but we observed, in the view from the wall and in the revelation of Odysseus, no particular interest in pedigrees. The *Catalogue* too has comparatively little genealogical material in comparison with its anecdotes, its bits of practical information about weapons, ships, and men, and its geographical notes. In the vision *des dames du temps jadis* in the *Necuia* (λ 235 ff.), the poet makes slight use of the opportunities to introduce family trees, and his chief interest is myth and story. In the logomachies which adorn the encounters of champions, allusions to descent are among the devices used to vary the monotony

of incessant fighting and slaying.³⁷ When there is a point to be made, the poet reminds us that the mother of Achilles is a goddess,³⁸ but the Aeacid pedigree is not set forth until almost the end of the poem, and then for a definite purpose.³⁹ The handing-down of the scepter is clearly not introduced for its genealogical interest,⁴⁰ nor can Zeus's comical catalogue of his illegitimate offspring (Ξ 317 ff.), though it includes several princely houses, be taken as a serious treatment of their illustrious origin. In general, there is slight attention to the lineage of the major champions or their divine descent.⁴¹ The few passages which really exhibit a striking use of genealogical material relate to the royal house of Troy and to the families of Glaucus, Theoclymenus, and Diomede.

The lines in which Aeneas recites the register of the princely house of Priam are a most interesting illustration of the poet's method. We note first the story of the wondrous horses sired by Boreas, interwoven with typical art into the pedigree. We note also that the speech—in fact, the whole episode—is looked upon by Leaf and others as a tissue of absurdities.⁴² It is in reality epic ornamentation on a scale too lavish for modern taste; where the modern reader demands rapid, tense, dramatic action, the ancient audience preferred leisurely and sonorous elaboration. The action of the poem up to this point has proceeded through a succession of lengthy and impressive movements,

³⁷ An excellent example is Ε 541 ff., where the pedigree of Diocles and the simile give the desired effect; in γ 488 f. = ο 186 f., where no artistic purpose would be served by elaborate ornamentation, two lines suffice. Cf. the vaunt of Idomeneus, Ν 448 ff. In general, anecdotes, geographical allusions, and the immediate relatives of the champions are oftener brought in than genealogies to vary the narrative of fighting. A quite erroneous impression is given by Bréal, *Pour mieux connaître Homère* (Paris, 1906), p. 73.

³⁸ E.g., Α 280; Φ 109; Τ 207.

³⁹ Φ 150 ff. The point is the contrast between descent from Zeus and from a mere river-god; the poet is working up to the conflict with the river, whose rising wrath is aggravated by this speech.

⁴⁰ Β 101 ff. I have pointed out in another connection ("Homeric Repetitions," *Univ. Calif. Pub. Class. Phil.*, XII No. 1 [1933], 16, n. 49) that the transmission of the scepter is part of the conventional adornment in the most elaborate introduction given to an assembly in the poems. The bit of genealogy—Pelops-Agamemnon—is incidental, and it would be well to compare the passage with other like epic adornment before emphasizing its importance for political ideas.

⁴¹ Leaf, pp. 12 f.

⁴² Introduction and notes to Τ *passim*. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 82 f.

the *aristeia* of Patroclus, his death, the long struggle over the body, the grief of Achilles, the making of the armor, the formal reconciliation—from the death of Patroclus eighteen hundred lines are sung before Achilles even enters the battle. Is he, then, at once to rush upon Hector, as Mr. Leaf would have had him do, and end the matter with a single well-directed thrust? That, truly, would be un-Homeric. The Homeric economy, at this point, calls for fourteen hundred lines more by way of prelude to the fatal blow. Of these the *μάχη παραποτάμος* provides nearly half and the Olympians play their part; of mortals, the Trojan champion most worthy after Hector is Aeneas. Aeneas must be met in battle by way of *προαγώνι*, but tradition forbids that he slay or be slain.⁴³ The poet deals with the problem according to his lights; to the modern the results may seem mere padding and prolixity,⁴⁴ but for the ancient audience, we may suspect, this was stately music, skilful elaboration of all the diverse material at the poet's command. It is here that the register of Trojan princes, with the story of the wondrous steeds and the translation of Ganymede, finds its place and function.

Glaucus' speech to Diomede is certainly infused with that pride of birth which is deprecated with gentle irony in the opening lines (Z 145 ff.). To be fully understood, however, it must be considered in relation to its artistic function and to other passages in which the poet speaks of the Lycian kings. The function of the episode in which the speech stands is to terminate without anticlimax the *aristeia* of Diomede. With the visit of Hector to Troy it effects the transition to the duel in Book vii. Its excellence would perhaps be more generally recognized were it not overshadowed by the scene between Hector and Andromache, for it is an effective solution of a real difficulty. Diomede cannot go on indefinitely wading in gore. How is he to be withdrawn from the center of the stage? He must make a good exit, yet he cannot be allowed to slay one of the major champions whose career is

⁴³ The limitations imposed upon the poet by tradition are well brought out by J. A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer* (Berkeley, 1921), chap. vii, "Hector." Aeneas, like Paris, belongs to tradition and owes to tradition his standing in the *Iliad*.

⁴⁴ Leaf (*loc. cit.* especially (introduction to T)): "The family history is only enough to delay the action at a moment where rapidity is needed." The same feeling inspires Allen's allusion to A-T (*Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* [Oxford, 1924], p. 195) as "heavy books, as heavy to a collator on a Venetian afternoon," etc. But the poet was composing for an audience with good red wine in its goblets, not for collators.

fixed by tradition. The poet solves the problem by introducing the public supplication in Troy (cf. Z 73 ff.) and the novel episode in which Diomedes vies with Glaucon in heroic courtesy. The recital of Glaucon's lineage is a dramatic necessity and is neatly motivated by Diomedes' fear of encountering a god (128 ff.). It also enables the poet to bring in the story of Bellerophon. Distinguished ancestry and divine descent have their due part in the recital, but great deeds and gallantry are equally important; here as elsewhere the poet portrays the Lycian leaders as ideal kings, champions and the sons of champions, fitted for the high place they hold by their personal qualities (M 309 ff.; II 549 ff.). To my thinking, the conceptions which dominate the passage have to do rather with the kingly ideal than with a nobility of birth in the ordinary sense.

The lines in the *Odyssey* which set forth the lineage of Theoclymenus (o 223 ff.) have likewise a definite artistic purpose. It is obvious that Theoclymenus is introduced for the sake of the scenes in which he declares to Penelope that Odysseus is in Ithaca (o 151 ff.) and warns the suitors of the doom which is closing down upon them (v 350 ff.). For these scenes no ordinary seer would serve, certainly not the ineffective Halitherses, so easily discomfited by Eurymachus in Book ii. The poet introduces a prince of seers, of the line of Melampus, and the passage in question is his introduction. The emphasis is upon the peerless prophet, as in the preceding instance it is upon the peerless king and champion.

When for a second time Agamemnon's nerves give way in the face of disaster, and the poet lets Diomedes take the lead (E 109 ff.), as he has done once before (I 29 ff.), the latter's apology for speaking up before his elders is modestly based upon the prowess of his fathers rather than his own. His house was rich and powerful, and its heads were fighters and champions, therefore might no man term him coward or weakling by birth and so scorn his word. Again we have to do with a kingly family, and the emphasis is upon personal qualities, and mainly upon prowess.

It appears, then, that the poet is not primarily interested in pedigrees and family trees. Genealogical material is introduced in moderate amount and for definite reasons of art. The emphasis is decidedly upon the qualities and characteristics which he associates with kings

and the families of kings. If in reality Homer lived in the heyday of aristocracy and sang for noble families who claimed precedence by virtue of illustrious lineage, it is amazing that he so consistently resisted the temptation to gratify these descendants of his gods and heroes by appropriate allusions, especially when he could have done it so easily, like Vergil, by the simple device of prophecy. Yet his use of prophecy is restricted to literary purposes and limited in the main to his narrative and the fortunes of his characters.⁴⁵ The gap between gods and men is not yet so broad that it needs to be bridged by elaborate genealogies, nor is kinship with the gods so great a distinction as it was to become with the development of the noble *γένη*. Zeus is still *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*.⁴⁶

On the whole, the genealogical allusions are in accord with what was found in the examination of the various words which are supposed to describe a nobility. They reflect distinctly the pre-eminence of kings and kingly families, in personal and warlike qualities, in power and in wealth, together with certain outward signs of this pre-eminence. They do not, in my opinion, contain any indication that there was a nobility intermediate between king and people, or in fact that the poet was acquainted with well-defined social classes.

(*To be concluded*)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

⁴⁵ Were there anything in the fanciful idea that the Aeneas episode in T was intended to gratify a family which claimed descent from that hero (e.g., Wilamowitz, pp. 83 f.), we might look for something a little better than T 307 f. in the way of prophecy. Leaf regards the episode as a glorification of Aeneas and perhaps an apology for having twice mentioned his previous lack of courage; a court poet who celebrates the progenitor of his patrons by mentioning twice so inglorious an occurrence and then leaving his hero to be dragged from under the mailed fist of his foeman was assuredly not very good at his job. See G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil* (Princeton, 1935), pp. 28 ff.

⁴⁶ The difference between Homeric and later feeling about divine descent appears distinctly from a comparison of two passages which develop the thought that no one, not even the greatest, is exempt from death. In Φ 109 f., Achilles says:

*πατρὸς δ' εἴμι ἀγαθός, θεός δέ με γείνατο μῆτρα,
ἀλλ' ἔπι τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταίη.*

In Callinus, frag. 1.12 f. (H.-Cr.), we find:

*οὐ γάρ κων θάνατον γε φυγεῖν εἰμαρμένον ἔστιν
ἀνδρί, οὐδὲ εἰ προγένων δὲ γένος ἀθανάτων.*

On *προγένων*, cf. *supra*, p. 198, and for the fatalistic feeling cf. Z 487 ff.

THE POSITION OF PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLIES IN THE
GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY OF THE
LATE ROMAN EMPIRE¹

BY JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

THE provincial assemblies of the Empire of the fourth and fifth centuries constitute a problem fascinating in itself and of far-reaching importance for the study of related and contemporary institutions. The subject is much too complicated and its ramifications too numerous to make it possible in a brief paper to do more than to touch on a few phases. The particular points to be considered are the position given the assemblies by the emperors in their plan of government, the membership and composition of the assemblies, their position in the social organization of the time, and their place in the evolution of assemblies through Greek and Roman times.

The most important single source for the study of the assemblies of this period is the Theodosian Code. The first hint of the importance of these bodies is the relative frequency with which they are mentioned in it. According to the chronological table of Mommsen and Meyer,² the first entry in the Code dates from 313; the earliest reference to a provincial assembly from 315.³ References to the assemblies become more frequent later in the reign of Constantine, but it should be noted that in these earlier documents there is nothing to indicate that these bodies are new or that communications addressed to them by an emperor constitute an innovation. It should be noted further that the nature of our sources is such that the failure to find any refer-

¹ This paper was read before the Ancient History Section of the American Historical Association at Urbana, Ill., on December 27, 1933. It is the result of the investigations carried on with the support of a grant from the Social Science Research Council.

² Th. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* (Berlin, 1905), I, Part I, ccix ff.

³ *Cod. Th.* viii. 4. 2., a citation from an *edictum ad Afros*. From the same year we have also *Cod. Just.* ii. 12. 21 addressed *ad concilium provinciae Africæ* and *Cod. Th.* ii. 30. 1 addressed *ad universos provinciales*. Documents addressed thus probably were intended for transmission to all provincial assemblies of the Empire. This problem will be discussed below.

ences to the assemblies for the reign of Diocletian proves nothing. Consequently, it is at present impossible to say whether the policy of Constantine with regard to the assemblies was originated by him or whether it was taken over from Diocletian.

Whatever the provincial assemblies of the period were, one thing is certain—they were not a mere accidental survival from the period of the principate. Direct evidence for the existence of assemblies in the various provinces can be adduced only in a relatively small number of cases, but there is enough to show that assemblies were organized in new provinces formed by the subdivision of older provinces. In Africa there is evidence for Tripolitana, Byzacena, Proconsularis, Numidia, and Mauretania Sitifensis. The Gallic provinces for which we have evidence include Lugdunensis III and Lugdunensis IV—provinces that were not organized before the latter part of the fourth century. This fact in itself goes far to prove that assemblies were organized as the result of a conscious policy and were intended to be general throughout the Empire. It is also a sign of the times that there is evidence for several Italian assemblies.⁴ In addition to provincial assemblies there were also diocesan assemblies. Best known is that of Viennensis, on which considerable light is thrown by an edict of Honorius of 418. As a source of information for the problems before us, this document ranks next in importance to the Theodosian Code.⁵

Already the distribution of the known provincial assemblies gives the impression that they were general throughout the Empire. This is indicated also by the legislation of the Theodosian Code, which shows that in time they became compulsory.⁶ The first document to indicate clearly that the emperor required every province to have an assembly,

⁴ For lists of the provincial assemblies of the period see Paul Guiraud, *Les assemblées provinciales dans l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1887), pp. 223 ff., and Kornemann in the article "Concilium" in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. IV (Stuttgart, 1901), at cols. 821 f. Evidence for several additional Gallic provinces is given by Joseph Zeller, "Concilia provincialia in Gallien in der späteren Kaiserzeit," *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst*, XXV (1906), 258–73. Zeller (*ibid.*, pp. 270 f.) argues that conditions in Gaul prove that provincial assemblies were general.

⁵ The text used in the present study is that of Ernest Carette, *Les assemblées provinciales de la Gaule romaine* (Paris, 1895), pp. 460 ff.

⁶ Cf. Th. Mommsen, "Epigraphische Analekten," *Gesammelte Schriften*, VIII (Berlin, 1913), 1–188, at pp. 32 f.; Kornemann in Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 822 f.; Victor Chapot, *Le monde romaine* (Paris, 1927), pp. 132 f.

and further that he required the members of certain classes to attend the meetings, was issued by Theodosius the Great in 392.⁷ The inclusion of the document in the Code indicates that the rule in question was considered binding for the entire Empire. Thus the practice of the time of demanding certain services from certain classes was extended to the provincial assemblies.

In connection with compulsory attendance, there arises the question as to whether the practice was originated by Theodosius or whether it was used also at an earlier date. In my opinion it cannot be dated earlier. From Constantine to Theodosius it appears that provincial assemblies were universal in the sense that they were authorized and encouraged and that their existence was taken for granted. It has been suggested by Mommsen⁸ that a general enactment concerning provincial assemblies was included by Constantine in 331 in a law addressed *ad universos provinciales*, and that earlier decrees of Constantine and Diocletian may have dealt with the same subject. Kornemann⁹ further suggests that the original measure on the subject must antedate 315, the year in which there first appears an edict addressed to a provincial assembly. This is probably correct, but these earlier enactments cannot have gone farther than to authorize and encourage the assemblies. Documents of the intervening period refer to them as something that is permitted rather than compulsory. In 355 Constantius grants all African provinces the right to have assemblies, to pass the resolutions they desire, to discuss matters of their own welfare, and to send embassies. He also adds a prohibition against any interference with these meetings.¹⁰ In 382 Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius in a general statement addressed *ad provinciales* grants to all dioceses and provinces the right to have assemblies.¹¹ There is a proviso included to the effect that meetings do not require authorization from governor, vicarius, or praetorian praefect—a hint that such officials at times did not look with favor upon the assemblies. Thus,

⁷ *Cod. Th.* xii. 12. 12.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰ *Cod. Th.* xii. 12. 1. In connection with the prohibition against interference, the term "dictator" is used. This is the only occurrence of the word in the Code. Cf. Otto Gradenitz, *Heidelberger Index zum Theodosianus* (Berlin, 1925), s.v. "dictator." Probably it is intended to cover any dictatorial private citizen as well as governors and officials.

¹¹ *Cod. Th.* xii. 12. 9.

the earliest possible date for the adoption of compulsion is somewhere between 382 and 392, and it seems natural to suppose that the actual date is 392.

There is nothing surprising in this situation. It is well known that provincial assemblies from time to time brought suit against former governors. It is also significant that of the 16 entries in the Theodosian Code under the heading "De legatis et decretis legationum" more than one-half are concerned in whole or in part with provincial assemblies.¹² This indicates that one of the chief functions of the assemblies was to send appeals and suggestions to the emperor. Such appeals must frequently have involved a direct or indirect criticism of imperial officials. Now when compulsion was applied, it must have been necessary to intrust its administration to those very officials whose activities the assemblies tended to check. It was natural to expect provincials to exercise the right of self-defense without being compelled to do so. Consequently, so long as the assemblies were active, or even so long as there was any hope that they might become so, it was natural for the government to issue orders restraining officials from interfering rather than to instruct these officials to compel attendance. Therefore, when the principle of compulsory attendance was adopted, it obviously implies that the system was breaking down and that a last desperate effort was made to revive the assemblies by means of an artificial stimulus.

One of the means for encouraging the assemblies deserves attention. The imperial post was placed at the disposal of envoys sent by them to the central government. A general enactment from 382 indicates to what extent the *legati* of diocesan and provincial assemblies can draw upon its services.¹³ The mere fact that the envoys of the assemblies were permitted to use it implies that they were considered important, for the general tendency of the time was to restrict the use of the public post.¹⁴

Further information concerning the rôle of the provincial assemblies can be derived from legislation addressed to them. This includes both

¹² *Ibid.* xii. 12. 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and probably also 6 and 16.

¹³ *Ibid.* xii. 12. 9.

¹⁴ Seck in Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 1861 f., s.v. "cursus publicus"; Premerstein, *ibid.*, XII, 1139 f., s.v. "legatus."

documents addressed to individual assemblies and legislation addressed *ad provinciales* and *ad universos provinciales*.¹⁵ On the face of it, documents of the latter kind cannot well have been intended for transmission to any agency other than the assemblies. This general impression is strengthened by an examination of the contents of some of the documents. An edict of 382 addressed *ad provinciales* safeguards both diocesan and provincial assemblies.¹⁶ Similarly, legislation issued by Constantine in 325 and 331 guaranteed in a more general way the right of appeal.¹⁷ Another enactment was directed against judicial corruption.¹⁸ It is more natural to believe that these documents were transmitted for publication to the provincial assemblies than to believe that they were intrusted to the tender mercies of those very officials whose manners and morals they sought to correct. A further study of the legislation in question would reveal that it contained also provisions of a different nature. In other words, the assemblies were assigned an important rôle as an agency for the publication of new legislation throughout the Empire. This must be considered a part of a general plan to avoid depending on officials and bureaucracy for everything.

It is now necessary to turn to the problem of the membership of the assemblies. The chief sources are again the Theodosian Code and the edict of Honorius of 418. These documents belong to the period in which attendance was compulsory and give information only concerning members that were required to attend. With the exception of certain *honorati* (former imperial officials), they have nothing to say about other groups that may have been permitted to attend. It is likely that there was at least one such group, the former provincial high priest, the *sacerdotales*. It is impossible to discuss here the complicated problem of the position of these priests under the Christian Empire. It must suffice to note that as late as A.D. 413 the *sacerdotales*

¹⁵ For lists see Mommsen-Meyer, I, Part I, clxiii f.

¹⁶ *Cod. Th.* xii. 12. 9. ¹⁷ *Ibid.* ix. 1. 4; xi. 30. 16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* i. 16. 6-7. In this document praetorian praefects and *comites*—once called *comites provinciarum*—are mentioned as officials that would receive complaints and transmit them to the emperor. This implies that there was to be a group of officials independent of the governors and accessible to the provincials that were to co-operate with the latter in serving as a check on the governors and their staffs.

were accustomed to flock to Carthage for festivals.¹⁹ It is difficult to believe that they were not allowed a voice in the assemblies, but it seems clear that as a class they were not compelled to attend. Individually, the majority probably belonged to the classes that were required to be present.

The regular members of the assembly can be divided into two groups, the *honorati* or former imperial officials and a group of representatives of municipalities probably best described as *curiales*. It is true that the latter term is not applied to them in the Theodosian Code but is found only in the edict of Honorius. In the Code, on the other hand, there is found a communication of 409 or 410 addressed to the *honorati* and *possessores* of Africa.²⁰ This apparently refers to the two classes of members of the assemblies. *Possessores* obviously must mean landholders. It occurs also in the edict of Honorius, but in the latter document *curiales* is used as interchangeable with it. Since the members of the municipal aristocracies were landholders, it is clear that *curiales* describes the class in its political aspect; *possessores*, in its economic aspect. It should be noticed that *curiales* is found in a document connected with a diocesan assembly and is used to describe the lowest class of its members. The membership of provincial assemblies must have been fully as broad as that of diocesan assemblies and so must have included *curiales*. Both types of assemblies, it seems, included the two classes *honorati* and *curiales*. In fact, so far as our scanty evidence permits us to distinguish, any difference in membership is found at the top and not at the bottom of the ladder. In the diocesan assembly of Viennensis, a special place was assigned to the provincial governors (*iudices*) of the diocese.

The class of *curiales* raises a problem of some difficulty. The assemblies cannot possibly have included all members of all the *curiae* or municipal councils within the province or diocese in question. Since a *curia* normally contained one hundred members, such an arrangement would have led to impossibly unwieldy assemblies. The key to the problem is found in that document of 392 by which attendance at

¹⁹ *Ibid.* xii. 1. 176. For *sacerdotes* and *sacerdotales* see Guiraud, pp. 246 ff.; Carette, pp. 271 ff.; E. Beurlier, *Le culte impérial* (Paris, 1891), pp. 290 ff.; Chapot in Daremburg-Saglio, IV, 947.

²⁰ *Cod. Th.* xi. 28. 5.

meetings of provincial assemblies was made compulsory.²¹ This document contains no reference either to *curiales* or to *possessores* but instead uses the term *primates*. By this is meant a group of the leading members of the *curia*—probably normally five in number—who served as leaders of the local government in a more real sense than the annual magistrates.²² It has been conjectured that also other *curiales* were permitted to attend, but it is more likely that the name was used merely because this group of members, in opposition to the *honorati*, was thought of as representatives of the *curiae* in the provinces.

By the legislation of 392 a little more freedom was allowed the *honorati* than the *curiales*. In the first place, it was provided that *praefectorii* (former praetorian praefects) were not expected to attend. Instead they were to be consulted in their homes.²³ Needless to say,

²¹ *Ibid.* xii. 12. 12. The document begins with a reference to extraordinary assemblies, but the section concerning compulsory attendance begins: "Ad provinciale concilium . . . volumus convenire." I take this to mean that the clause concerning compulsory attendance refers to provincial assemblies in general.

²² This has been worked out by Otto Seeck, "Decemprimat und Dekaprotie," *Klio*, I (1901), 147–87, at pp. 161 f., on the basis of the *album* of Thamugas (Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae* [Berlin, 1892–1916], No. 6122). Cf. also Guiraud, pp. 262 ff.; Carette, pp. 363 ff.

Ammianus xiv. 7. 1 shows that the *primates urbium* formed a group between the *honorati* and the *plebei*. *Cod. Th.* xii. 1. 190 shows that there were five *primates* at Alexandria. The *album* of Thamugas has at its head five patrons, followed by a second group of five men. The explanation of Seeck is that the *decemprimi* were made up of five honorary members and five members of the *curia* who actually were in charge of the conduct of the local government. *Cod. Th.* xii. 1. 190 from A.D. 436 grants to the five *primates* of Alexandria immunity from corporal punishment in order that they may speak freely in defense of the interests of their city. This implies real responsibility and would fit admirably members of a provincial assembly. *Cod. Th.* vii. 18. 13, a document dating from 403, provides that information concerning measures to be taken against deserters is to be brought *ad notitiam primatum urbium vicorum castellorumque*. This implies that the *primates* were the most responsible authority in the community.

Seeck's identification of the eastern *dekaproto* with the western *decemprimi* has been challenged by Victor Chapot, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris, 1904), pp. 272 f. For more recent accounts see M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social & Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 341 f., 358 f., and notes on these passages; Ernst Stein, *Geschichte des Spätromischen Reiches*, I (Wien, 1928), 72 f. This complicated problem cannot be discussed here. It is enough to note that there seems to be every reason for believing that a small group of the *curiales* were held responsible for their community.

²³ *Cod. Th.* xii. 12. 12. In the statement concerning compulsion the following is found: "Cunctos volumus convenire, qui primatum honorantur insignibus, exceptis praefectoriis." This must mean that, except for the *praefectorii*, the *primates* and all men of higher rank are expected to attend, i.e., that the other *honorati* must attend.

the *praefectorii* cannot have been so numerous that this ceremony constituted a normal part of the procedure at the meetings. Later in the same year the *honorati* in general were given the choice, in the case of extraordinary meetings, between being present in person or sending someone else to act for them.²⁴ No such privileges are mentioned in connection with the diocesan assembly of Viennensis. The only concessions made in its case is that two of the governors of more remote provinces were permitted to send *legati* instead of appearing in person. Otherwise not only *curiales* but also *honorati* and even provincial governors were subject to fines if they failed to attend. Fines, by the way, are not mentioned in the earlier documents and so may mean an additional sign of decay and an additional application of a stimulus.

What is the place of an assembly constituted in the manner described in the evolution of political institutions? As a starting-point it is necessary to take the representative assemblies found in the Greek federal leagues. These consisted of elected representatives. From what little information we have, it is safe to conclude that the various units of the league were represented in proportion to their size. This principle was applied already in the distribution of the members of the council of five hundred in Athens among the demes of Attica.²⁵ Though the principle was not applied in such looser organizations as the Peloponnesian and Delian leagues, it was applied in the Boeotian League of the time of the Peloponnesian War,²⁶ and was taken over by Philip of Macedon in his Hellenic League, better known

²⁴ *Ibid.* xii. 12. 13.

²⁵ Aristotle (*The Constitution of the Athenians* 62. 1) makes it clear that the representatives in the council were chosen by demes. Lists of members preserved in inscriptions show that the representation of the demes varied greatly. It is clear that the number of representatives must have depended on the number of citizens belonging to the deme. For a brief treatment of the subject with indication of further literature see Georg Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde: Zweite Hälfte* ed. Heinrich Swoboda (München, 1926), p. 882, and n. 4. The epigraphical material is summarized and discussed briefly by A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 49-66.

²⁶ *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* xi. Notice the eleven units of representation of which a city may control one, more than one, or merely a part of one. For an account of the League and bibliography see Busolt, *op. cit.*, pp. 1409 ff.

as the Corinthian League.²⁷ It was then only natural that the same system should be employed in the true federal states of the Hellenistic period. Evidence of this exists for the Aetolian League,²⁸ the Achaean League,²⁹ and probably the Boeotian League.³⁰ This is enough to make

²⁷ The evidence is supplied by an inscription. This can be consulted conveniently in Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*³ (Leipzig, 1915-24), No. 260. The literature on the subject is very large. It must suffice to refer to Busolt, *op. cit.*, p. 1393, and W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization*² (London, 1930), pp. 64 ff.

²⁸ Dittenberger, *op. cit.*, No. 546 B. This document shows that two cities of the League had been merged into one community and together possessed several representatives. It is provided that in case of future separation of the communities, the smaller city is to retain one of these representatives. In connection with the Hellenistic leagues, it must be noted that E. A. Freeman's *History of Federal Government* (2d ed. by J. B. Bury; London, 1893) is too old to have made use of much important material concerning the details of the organization of the leagues and so for this reason is no longer a reliable guide, not to mention that Freeman's point of view was such as to cause him to go wrong at times. The most convenient guide for the student that wishes to investigate these problems is now Busolt's *Griechische Staatskunde*. Cf. also Tarn's contributions on the subject in the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

²⁹ In the Achaean League direct evidence exists not for the larger representative assembly but only for the smaller board of *nomographoi*. This is again supplied by an inscription, *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*, I, 74. Cf. Heinrich Swoboda, "Die neuen Urkunden von Epidaurus," *Hermes*, LVII (1922), 518-34, at pp. 519 ff. On account of the prevalence of the principle in the Greek institutions of the time it is safe to conclude that the same principle was applied also in the larger representative assembly. It is known that in the primary assembly that was called from time to time to deal with special questions the vote was not counted by heads but by cities. It has been suggested, plausibly enough, that here also the cities were assigned a certain number of votes depending on their size (cf. Swoboda, *op. cit.*, pp. 521 f.).

The statement concerning the institutions of the Achaean League just made is in accord with the common theory that the League had a representative assembly, the *synodos*, and a primary assembly, the *synkletos*. The latter body did not have regular times for meeting but met only when specially summoned to deal with certain problems of outstanding importance. This theory has been questioned recently. In an article appearing s.v. *σύνοδος* in the fourth volume of Pauly-Wissowa, *Zweite Reihe*, Kahrstedt has argued that the League for a long time possessed only a representative assembly, and that the primary assembly did not originate before during the second century B.C. It is not likely that Kahrstedt's interpretation will be accepted generally. It has already been opposed by André Aymard in his article, "Une hypothèse nouvelle sur les assemblées achaiennes," *Revue des études anciennes*, XXXV (1933), 445-62. Aymard, although he has not yet published a full statement of his theory, obviously is ready to go to the opposite extreme and maintain that also the *synodos* was a primary assembly (*ibid.*, *passim*, and particularly p. 459, n. 5).

³⁰ The Boeotian League of the time does not seem to have had a representative assembly but it had an executive board of Boeotarchs, and the principle seems to have applied in the composition of this board. Our evidence, unfortunately, deals not directly with this but with officials known as *aphedriateuontes*. See Maurice Holleaux, "Dédicaces nouvelles de la Confédération bœotienne," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, XIII (1889), 1-23 and 225-29.

it reasonably certain that in their representative assemblies the federal leagues of the time normally employed the system of representation in proportion to size.

This was the type of assembly that the Romans found existing in the Greek world when they conquered it, and this is the type that would be copied in the provincial assemblies in so far as they were of Greek or Hellenistic origin or were modeled on Greek and Hellenistic patterns. This means that we should not, as scholars have done, expect to find an equality of representation and so treat examples of representation on the proportional principles as exceptions to the rule.³¹ In the east we have evidence for representation in proportion to size in the Lycian³² and Thessalian³³ assemblies; in the west, for the assembly of the Three Gauls.³⁴ It is not at all impossible that further investigation may uncover evidence for the use of the same system also in other provinces. It must be admitted that it is also possible that evidence may be found to prove that in some assembly or as-

³¹ This is done by Guiraud, pp. 64 f. On the contrary we should expect to find the system of representation according to size employed and have a right to take for granted that it was employed unless evidence to the contrary is adduced.

³² Strabo xiv. 3. 664. Lycia at the time described by Strabo was nominally independent but its *koinon* was continued after the annexation of the district and probably retained the same system of representation. The Lycian League is important as a direct link between Hellenistic and Roman times.

³³ *Inscriptiones Graecae*, IX, Part II, 261. This document records a vote taken during the reign of Tiberius. There were 298 votes on one side of the question, 31 on the other side, and 5 invalid votes. Since the number of cities was far less than 334, it is obvious that cities had several votes, and in the light of the evidence already discussed, it is safe to conclude that the representatives were assigned to the cities on the principle of proportion.

³⁴ The evidence is given by Guiraud (p. 64). It does not directly prove more than that certain cities had several representatives. This might be reconcilable with a system of one vote per city. On this point, however, help is given by a document which shows that in the assembly of Narbonensis the former high priests possessed the *sententiae dicendae signandique ius* (*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, XII, 6038). In spite of difficulties of interpretation, it is clear that the expression refers to members of the assembly acting and voting as individuals and not by delegations. In my opinion the much-discussed Sollemnus inscription (*ibid.*, XIII, 3162) proves that also in the assembly of the Three Gauls the members acted individually. This makes it reasonably certain that in the assemblies of Gaul the method of assigning representatives to cities in proportion to their size was employed, and that these representatives voted separately and not by delegations.

semblies the principle of equality of representation was employed.³⁵ If such a case should be found, it should be treated as an exception, unless, of course, proof should be forthcoming for an overwhelmingly large number of provinces. At present, however, everything indicates that as far as the regular elected members are concerned, the provincial assemblies of the Principate were made up much as the assemblies of Hellenistic federal leagues.

This does not tell quite the entire story. It is generally agreed that also former high priests had a right to membership in the assemblies³⁶—a right which they naturally held for life. This can be said to be the purely Roman or western contribution to the development of the assemblies. The Roman influence tended to produce such bodies as the Roman senate and the municipal *curiae* in which individuals who had reached a certain dignity retained membership for life. The conclusion is then that during the period of the Principate, the provincial assemblies, at least of the west, were a hybrid institution. In so far as they were composed of elected representatives, they followed the pattern of Greek assemblies. In so far as they granted life-membership to former high priests, they had been transformed by Roman influence. In most assemblies it is probable that the elected members predominated.

When we turn to the assemblies of the Late Empire, there is a marked change. Gone is the election of representatives. Election no longer influences the membership except in so far as *curiales* had reached their high station in society by means of it. Gone is also, in all probability, the representation of communities in proportion to size. Instead the communities are now represented by a group of the leading members of their local *curiae*—groups that are equal in number for large and small cities. The second class of regular members, the *honorati*, in no sense represent any particular community. They

³⁵ Guiraud (p. 64 and n. 6) claims the assembly of the Panhellenes as an instance of this. The evidence that he cites is not conclusive. Even if his theory is correct in this instance, the Panhellenes differed greatly from provincial assemblies, and their example would afford no guide to the usage of the latter.

³⁶ Carette, pp. 106 ff.; Kornemann in Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 813. Carette also suggests that *patroni* may have been members. This I doubt. If they were members, they would be few in number and would not alter greatly the composition of the body.

are given membership as individuals that have attained high rank in the service of the state. Of the two forces that collaborated in the formation of the assemblies of the Principate, the Roman influence has won out completely over the Greek. The assemblies are now much more like mediaeval assemblies than those of either Greek leagues or modern states.

The comparison with the assemblies of the later Middle Ages must not be carried too far. The *sacerdotales*, *honorati*, and *curiales* do not correspond to the three estates of clergy, nobles, and townsmen. There is no evidence that the *sacerdotales* as a class influenced the decisions of the assemblies or exercised a clerical influence. Nor were the *curiales* real townsmen that represented urban or commercial interests. Both *curiales* and *honorati* were former officeholders. The difference was merely in the importance and character of the offices held. Equally important is the fact that both *honorati* and *curiales* were landholders and belonged to the agricultural aristocracy. Thus the assemblies were controlled by a single class which can be described as the landholding nobility of the provinces.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

VARRO'S *DE GENTE POPULI ROMANI*

BY LILY ROSS TAYLOR

VARRO'S *De gente populi Romani*¹ dealt in four books with the Greek and Roman background of the Roman people and told *quid a quaque traxerint gente per imitationem* (Ser. *Aen.* vii. 176). As we know the work from the citations which come chiefly from the account of the *terrena civitas* in the eighteenth book of Augustine's *De civitate dei*, it was concerned largely with legendary kings, beginning with the first flood under the Theban Ogyges, and continuing to the founding of Roma and at least to the death of Romulus.² According to a chronological system which apparently depended on Varro's contemporary Castor of Rhodes, it treated of the Sicyonian, Argive, Athenian, Laurentian, and Alban kings, and attempted in rationalizing manner to explain many of the legends related about them.³ It was filled with *curiosae computationes* about chronology and eras, one detail of which provides the means of dating the work. Varro stated that the interval between the flood of Deucalion and the consulship of Hirtius and Pansa was less than two thousand years.⁴ Obviously the consulship mentioned, 43 B.C., was the date when Varro was writing.

In discussing the character of the *De gente populi Romani*, scholars have been more interested in the sources of the work than in the circumstances under which it was written and have not in general attempted to interpret it in the light of the events of 43. It was, however,

¹ Peter, *Hist. Rom. Rel.*, I, 10 ff., xxxiii ff.; Fraccaro, *Studi Varroniani; De gente populi Romani* (Padua, 1907). See also C. Frick, *Die Quellen Augustins im XVIII Buche seiner Schrift De civitate dei* (Höxter, 1886).

² Aug. *CD* xviii. 2: "Marcus Varro scribens de gente populi Romani. . . . Ab his enim Sicyoniorum regibus ad Athenienses pervenit, a quibus ad Latinos, inde Romanos." The only definite fact known as to the division of the books is that the second book ended with the Trojan War. See *ibid.* 13. Varro is quoted fourteen times in this book, four times with specific mention of the *De gente populi Romani*.

³ On Varro's attitude toward myths see *ibid.* 10: "Et tamen Marcus Varro non vult fabulosis adversus deos fidem adhibere figmentis, ne de maiestatis eorum dignitate indignum aliquid sentiat."

⁴ Arnob. *Adv. gentes* v. 8: "Varro . . . in librorum quattuor primo quos de gente conscriptos Romani populi dereliquit curiosis computationibus edocet ab diluvii tempore . . . ad usque Hirti consulatum et Pansae annorum esse milia nondum duo."

suggested by Peter⁵ that Varro's work was prompted by the appearance of the comet at Caesar's games and the predictions of a new age which the comet inspired. Varro quoted in the work certain astrologers who stated that a complete rebirth, *παλιγγενεσία*, took place every four hundred and forty years. The interval represents four periods of one hundred and ten years, and the passage has often been cited as the earliest evidence for the *saeculum* adopted by Augustus as the basis for his celebration of the secular games in 17. Peter attempted to show that Varro's work established in the Roman background a series of cycles of four hundred and forty years. But the chronological details quoted from Varro do not support Peter's contention, and scholars, unable to accept his arithmetic, have discounted the suggestion that the work was prompted by the comet. It is the purpose of this paper to show that, although Varro's eras cannot be definitely worked out, Peter was right in interpreting the *De gente populi Romani* in the light of the period in which it was written, and indeed in associating it with the discussion aroused by the interpretation of the *sidus Iulium*.

The comet was explained not only as a symbol of a new age but as a sign that Julius Caesar had been received among the gods (Pliny *NH* ii. 94). Now in his accounts of the early kings Varro emphasized particularly the rulers who after their death secured divine honors. The *De gente* included many other matters—rationalization of myths like the contest of Athena and Neptune at Athens, a discussion of werewolves and the *Luperci*, various details about *ludi*, an account of the signs given by the planet Venus before the first flood, much material on eras, some description of the praiseworthy discipline of early life in Italy. But Augustine's full citations from it are concerned primarily with kings, and particularly the rulers among them who earned the right to be enrolled among the gods. I shall quote the pertinent passages from *CD XVIII*, following Augustine's order, and including only sections which Fraccaro in his careful study has accepted as genuine fragments or summaries of Varro's work. The italics are Fraccaro's, indicating details which he does not attribute to Varro.

2. *Sicyoniorum autem regnum tunc tenebat Telxion.* Quo regnante usque adeo ibi mitia et laeta tempora fuerunt ut eum defunctum velut deum colerent sacrificando et ludos celebrando, quos ei primitus institutos ferunt.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, xxxiii ff.

3. Etiam apud sepulcrum septimi sui regis Thuriaci sacrificare Sieyonios solere Varro refert. . . . [Of an Argive king:] Phegous tamen frater huius Phoronei iunior cum esset mortuus, ad eius sepulcrum templum est constitutum in quo coleretur ut deus et ei boves immolarentur. *Credo honore tanto ideo dignum putarunt* quia in regni sui parte . . . iste sacella constituerat ad colendos deos et docuerat observari tempora per menses atque annos quid eorum quatenus metirentur atque numerarent. Haec in eo nova mirantes rudes adhuc homines morte obita deum esse factum sive opinati sunt sive voluerunt. *Nam et Io filia Inachi fuisse perhibetur quae postea Isis appellata ut magna dea culta est in Aegypto; quamvis alii scribant eam ex Aethiopia in Aegyptum venisse reginam et quod late iusteque imperaverit eisque multa commoda et litteras instituerit, hunc honorem illi habitum esse divinum, postea quam ibi mortua est, et tantum honorem ut capitali crimine reus fieret si quis eam fuisse hominem diceret.*

5. *His temporibus rex Argivorum Apis navibus transvectus in Aegyptum, cum ibi mortuus fuisse, factus est Serapis, omnium maximus Aegyptiorum deus. Nominis autem huius cur non Apis etiam post mortem sed Serapis appellatus sit, facillimam rationem Varro reddidit. Quia enim arca, in qua mortua ponitur, quod omnes iam sarcophagum vocant *σόρος* dicitur Graece, et ibi eum venerari sepultum coepерant, priusquam templum eius esset exstructum: velut soros et Apis Sorapis primo, deinde una littera, ut fieri adsolet, commutata Serapis dictus est. Et constitutum est etiam de illo, ut, quisquis eum hominem fuisse dixisset, capitalem penderet poenam. Et quoniam fere in omnibus templis, ubi colebantur Isis et Serapis, erat etiam simulacrum quod digito labiis impresso admonere videretur, ut silentium fieret: hoc significare idem Varro existimat ut homines eos fuisse taceretur.*

6. Regnante Argo suis coepit uti frugibus Graecia et habere segetes in agricultura delatis aliunde seminibus. Argus quoque post obitum deus haberi coepit, templo et sacrificio honoratus. Qui honor eo regnante ante illum delatus est homini privato et fulminato euidam Homogyro, eo quod primus ad aratum boves iunxerit.

8. *Usque ad Cecropem regem Atheniensium . . . relati sunt in deorum numerum aliquot mortui caeca et vana consuetudine ac superstitione Graecorum. In quibus Criasi regis coniux Melantomice et Phorbas filius eorum qui post patrem rex Argivorum sextus fuit et septimi regis Triopae filius Iasus et rex nonus Sthenelas sive Stheneleus. . . .*

12. His temporibus Dionysum, qui etiam Liber pater dictus est et post mortem deus habitus, vitem ferunt ostendisse in Attica terra hospiti suo.

15. [Of Saturn or Sterce:] *Qualibel autem ex causa eum Saturnum appellare voluerint, certe tamen hunc Sterten sive Stercutium merito agriculturae fecerunt deum. Picum quoque similiiter eius filium in talium deorum numerum receperunt, quem praeclarum augarem et belligeratorem fuisse asserunt. Picus Faunum genuit, Laurentum regem secundum; etiam iste deus illis vel*

est vel fuit. Hos ante Troianum bellum divinos honores mortuis hominibus detulerunt.

16. Graeci victores deletam Troiam relinquentes . . . diversis et horrendis cladibus dilacerati atue contriti sunt; et tamen etiam ex eis deorum suorum numerum auxerunt. Nam et Diomedem fecerunt deum. [There follows the story that Diomede's companions were turned into birds.] *Quibus nec deus, ut putant, factus humanam revocare naturam vel ipse potuit vel certe a Iove suo rege tamquam caelicola novicius impetravit.* Quin etiam templum eius esse aiunt in insula Diomedea. . . .

19. Sed Aenean quoniam quando mortuus est non comparuit, deum sibi fecerunt Latini. Sabini etiam regem suum primum Sancum *sive, ut aliqui appellant, Sanctum* rettulerunt in deos. . . . [Of Codrus:] Et hunc Athenienses tamquam deum sacrificiorum honore coluerunt.

21. Latium post Aenean quem deum fecerunt, undecim reges habuit, quorum nullus deus factus est. Aventinus autem, qui duodecimo loco Aenean sequitur, cum esset prostratus in bello et sepultus in eo monte qui etiam nunc eius nomine nuncupatur, deorum *talium quales sibi faciebant*, numero est additus. Alii sane noluerunt eum in proelio scribere occisum, sed non comparuisse dixerunt. . . . Post hunc non est deus factus in Latio nisi Romulus conditor Romae.

These passages show that Varro was especially concerned with the kings in Rome's Greek and Roman background who because of their benefits to men had been granted divine honors. It is hardly possible that he could have discussed the deification of rulers in 43 without reference to the divinity of Julius Caesar which was then one of the great questions of the moment. Caesar's deification, decreed before his death, had not been formally inaugurated in state cult. In the year and a half between the death of Caesar and the formation of the triumvirate, Octavian was attempting to establish his own position by putting into effect the deification of Caesar, and Antony was vigorously opposing the divinity of Caesar which would legalize the claims of his rival, who was Caesar's heir. The fortunate appearance of the comet at Caesar's funeral games in July of 44 gave support to Octavian's efforts, and he placed a star on the statues of Caesar as a symbol that Caesar had been received in heaven. The comet appeared on a coin, issued no doubt by a moneyer who favored Octavian, before the end of 44.⁶ There seems to have been some discussion of the place of deified men in Roman cult. When Antony in a temporary concession to Octavian put through a bill adding one day in Caesar's honor

⁶ See my *Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, pp. 81 ff.

to all the festivals of the gods, Cicero in the first *Philippic* (13), delivered in September of 44, opposed the measure, indicating that it was contrary to Roman precedent. "I could not be induced to unite a man who has died with the religion of the immortal gods or to consent to a public thanksgiving to one whose tomb exists where funeral offerings are made."

The *De gente* provided the precedents in the Roman past which Cicero had failed to find. Coming from Varro, who since the appearance of the three books on *Res divinae* which completed his *Antiquitates* was an acknowledged authority on religious matters, they would have had great weight. In the *Res divinae* he had devoted his attention to *di certi*, *incerti*, and *selecti* and had taken no account of deified rulers. In the four books of the *De gente populi Romani* he made up for the lack in the earlier work, and showed that if one looked back far enough into the legendary past, the Romans could find precedents for the deification of rulers. He explained the divinity accorded to the kings by a rationalizing account which showed that the kings had been deified because of services to their people. Although we know of no reference to Julius Caesar in the work, it would have been easy on the basis of the material cited by Varro to justify Caesar's divinity because of his services to the Roman state. Varro had models for his work in romantic writings of the early Hellenistic age—Leon of Pella's imaginary letter of Alexander to Olympias, Hecateus of Abdera's *Aegyptiaca*, Euhemerus' *Sacred History*.⁷ Just as these writers had provided support for the divinity of kings in the period that followed the death of Alexander the Great, Varro in his rationalization of the legendary past of the Romans lent the weight of his authority to Octavian in his attempt to deify Caesar.

There are in the work other details which may be related to the time when it was written. The emphasis on Egyptian gods⁸—a digression from the discussion of the Argive kings with whom some legends associated them—may be due to the popularity of these divinities at the time. The references to the *ludi* and to the *Luperci* may be related

⁷ See Kaerst, *Gesch. des Hellenismus*, II², 178 ff. It is curious that although the "Euhemeristic" tendencies of Varro's work have been fully recognized, scholars have failed to relate it to the deification of Caesar.

⁸ See Fraccaro, *op. cit.*, p. 34; cf. Dio xlvii. 15. 4.

to Caesar, for the permanent establishment of *ludi* for Caesar was insisted upon by Octavian, and there had been instituted in Caesar's honor a new college of *Luperci* known as *Iuliani*.⁹ The detail about the change in the planet Venus which predicted the first flood may be explained by the fact that the comet had made men conscious of signs in the heavens.

The predictions of a new age which the comet inspired are also reflected in the puzzling references to ages and eras in the fragments of Varro's work. Octavian reported in his memoirs the speech of a certain *haruspex* Vulcanius who interpreted the comet as the symbol of the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth *saeculum*.¹⁰ There was at the moment discussion between *haruspices* and adherents of Sibylline prophecies as to the explanation of eras, and Varro, whose sympathies with the neo-Pythagoreans are known,¹¹ probably joined the supporters of the Sibyl. A passage already mentioned, which Augustine (*CD* xxii. 28) quotes in Varro's own words, is concerned with the subject.

Genethliaci quidam scripserunt, inquit, esse in renascendis hominibus quam appellant $\pi\alpha\lambda\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\tau$ Graeci; hac scripserunt confici in annis numero quadringentis quadraginta ut idem corpus et eadem anima quae fuerint coniuncta in homine aliquando eadem rursus redeant in coniunctionem.¹²

The $\pi\alpha\lambda\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota\alpha$, a Neo-Pythagorean idea, was the *magnus annus*,¹³ the time of renewal when soul and body returned to their original combination, and sun, moon, and planets came back to the relative position from which they had set forth at the beginning of the cycle.

⁹ Dio xlv. 6; xlv. 30; Suet. *Caes.* 76. From Cicero *Phil.* xiii. 31 it appears that Caesar had assigned land to the priests which was later taken away.

¹⁰ Serv. *Dan.* on Vergil *Ecl.* ix. 47.

¹¹ Pliny *NH* xxxv. 46.

¹² From Augustine's next words (*Iste Varro quidem sive illi genethliaci nescio qui*) it would seem that Varro indorsed the opinion of the *genethliaci*. Although he did not, according to Augustine, mention the *genethliaci* by name, it is probable that one of them was Varro's friend, Tarutius, who plotted the horoscope of the city of Rome (Cic. *Div.* ii. 98—a work completed after Caesar's death) and also at Varro's request (Plut. *Rom.* 12) the horoscope of Romulus. Perhaps it was while working on the *De gente* that Varro asked Tarutius for information about Romulus' horoscope.

¹³ Cicero *ND* ii. 51: "Quarum [the reference is to planets] ex disparibus motionibus magnum annum mathematici nominaverunt qui tum efficitur cum Solis et Lunae et quinque errantium ad eandem inter se comparationem confectis omnium spatiis est facta conversio." Cf. Censorinus 18. 11.

The symbols of the new age are prominent on the coins of the period, notably on *aurei* of 43, which show sun, moon, and five planets.¹⁴

We can follow the ideas that were current not only through the representations on coins but in the *Eclogues* of Vergil written in the years immediately following the appearance of the *De gente populi Romani*. The Julian star, with the benefits it brought to men, appears in the ninth *Eclogue*.

Ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum
Astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo
Duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem.

And the deification of Caesar is celebrated in the fifth.

Candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi
Sub pedibus videt nubes et sidera Daphnis.

Finally, the new age is sung in the fourth *Eclogue*

Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas;
Magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur aetas.

The *De gente populi Romani* is then to be included in the literature of propaganda issued by the supporters of Octavian and Antony in the years of their struggle for power.¹⁵ In it Varro, by providing precedents for the deification of Caesar, aligned himself with Octavian. This fact throws some light on the circumstances of Varro's life. He had long been prominent in public affairs, and had often shown political tendencies in his writings. From the time of the war with Sertorius in which he probably took part, he was a staunch supporter of Pompey. He was *praefectus classis* in the war with the pirates and *legatus* of Pompey in Spain at the beginning of the civil war. Before Pompey went to Spain in 77, Varro addressed to him the *Ephemeris navalis*, a work dealing with the route to Spain, and before Pompey entered upon his first consulship in 70, Varro, on request, provided the seasoned warrior with a handbook on procedure in the conduct of senatorial meetings (Gell. xiv. 7). Perhaps as a justification of Pompey's course against Caesar, Varro wrote three books *De Pompeio*. For

¹⁴ Cf. Bahrfeldt, *Röm. Goldmünzenprägungen*, Pl. V, Nos. 8, 9, 10; Alföldi, *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 369 ff.

¹⁵ Professor Kenneth Scott in his paper on "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, XI (1933), 1 ff., has dealt rather with the charges which Antony and Octavian made against each other than with the evidence for political pamphlets in the period.

a considerable time, too, he maintained friendly relations with Caesar, and it may have been before the civil war that he addressed to Caesar as *pontifex maximus* the second half of his *Antiquitates*,¹⁶ which dealt with *Res divinae*. In Caesar's eyes (BC ii. 17, 19-21) Varro showed himself a time-server in his actions as *legatus* of Spain in 49. Eventually he was forced to surrender his legions to Caesar and after being set free by the dictator went to join Pompey in the East. After Pharsalus, like Cicero, Varro returned to Rome and was pardoned by Caesar. He seems, from the letters which Cicero wrote to him in 46 (*Ad. fam.* ix. 1-7), to have had much the same attitude that Cicero had toward Caesar's régime. Varro was then spending his time in his villas, devoting himself to writing. Like Cicero, he wrote a *laudatio* of Cato's sister Porcia. But eventually Varro seems to have come closer to Caesar than Cicero did. He was intrusted by the dictator with the task of securing Greek and Latin books for the great public library which Caesar planned to establish (Suet. *Caes.* 44). After Caesar's death Varro seems immediately to have become an enemy of Antony, who, probably in April or May of 44, plundered Varro's villa near Casinum.¹⁷ Like Cicero, Varro seems to have been in contact with Octavian—and perhaps also with the *liberatores*—and at one time expressed disapproval of a plan of the *puer*.¹⁸ In the autumn of 43 Varro wrote a political pamphlet of some sort in which Cicero was interested.¹⁹

The *De gente populi Romani* indicates that in the confusing political situation of 43 Varro cut himself off entirely from the adherents of the

¹⁶ The statement is frequently made that Varro dedicated the *Res divinae* to Caesar in the autumn of 47. Although it is possible that such was the case, there is no sure indication of date except that the books had appeared before the completion of the *Academica* of Cicero in 45. Merckel's arguments (in the Introduction to his edition of Ovid's *Fasti* [1841], p. cx) are not convincing.

¹⁷ Cic. *Phil.* ii. 102-5. Antony's seizure of Varro's villa has often been dated during the civil war, but, as Boissier has pointed out (*Etude sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Terentius Varro*, p. 18), Cicero is clearly referring to the period after Caesar's death.

¹⁸ *Ad Att.* xvi. 9 (November 3 or 4, 43 B.C.): "Varroni quidem displicet consilium pueri, mihi non."

¹⁹ Cicero refers to it in letters of the autumn of 44 as "Ηρακλείδειον, the word he usually employs for a political writing either of his own or of someone else. See *Ad Att.* xvi. 11. 3: "a quo (Varrone) adhuc Ηρακλείδειον illud non abstuli"; xvi. 12: "De Ηρακλείδειῳ Varronis negotia salsa. Me quidem nihil umquam sic delectavit." Possibly this work was an earlier form of the *De gente*. A διάλογος of Varro is also mentioned in *Ad Att.* xv. 13. 3.

liberatores and went over to Octavian's side.²⁰ But when late in that year the triumvirate was formed, the support which he had given to Octavian did not save Varro from being placed on the proscription list. His enemy Antony was probably firm about the inclusion of his name. The reason for Varro's proscription given by Appian (*BC* iv. 47) is that as both soldier and general he had been a foe to monarchy. It was against Antony that he had to be protected when he was hidden at the villa of Calenus, and it was probably due to Octavian that he was finally pardoned. He lived on under Octavian's rule until his death in 27, writing until the end. The *De re rustica*, which he wrote in 37, may have been intended to further Octavian's agrarian policy.²¹ The favor of Octavian is perhaps shown by the fact that when Asinius Pollio established the first public library in Rome, Varro, who had had charge of a similar project under Caesar, had the honor of being the only living man whose statue was set up in the library.²² The support which Varro gave to the divinity of Caesar in the *De gente populi Romani* seems in the end to have been rewarded.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

²⁰ The *De vita populi Romani* has also been attributed to the year 43, but there is no evidence for its date beyond the fact that it was certainly written after the civil war.

²¹ See Ferrero, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, III, 298 ff.

²² Pliny *NH* vii. 115.

SIMONIDES AND SCOPAS

BY C. M. BOWRA

THE *σκόλιον*, if such it be, which Simonides wrote for Scopas, is not likely to gain much from textual criticism. Plato's slapdash methods of quotation and the wanton misinterpretations of Socrates have probably yielded as much truth as can be elicited from them, and for most purposes the text published by J. Aars in 1888¹ is as satisfactory as we can hope for. But the interpretation of the poem has excited so many different solutions that we must admit that the critics have been singularly unsuccessful at least in finding agreement with each other. J. Adam speaks of "the easy-going morality of the poem"² and H. W. Smyth says that "it is uncertain whether the poet is endeavouring to free Scopas from an accusation based on some specific act of injustice, or to furnish him with an ethical code that may excuse a persistent policy of oppression."³ These slighting estimates of the great poet of Hellenic *ἀρετά* have aroused his friends to speak up for him. For Wilamowitz, Simonides is formulating a new principle of morality which substitutes the voice of conscience for the rule of habit⁴ and for Mr. J. T. Sheppard he "is warning his patron against self-righteousness."⁵ For all these views there is perhaps some justification, but so great a divergence of opinion is disturbing in a poem whose words and syntax are far from difficult. It seems worth while to look at the poem again and see if we can extract its meaning by paying close attention to what it says.

The situation is clear. Scopas has asked Simonides for his opinion of the saying of Pittacos, *χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι*, and the poem is Simonides' answer to him, just as his famous lines, *τίς κεν αἰνήσειε κ.τ.λ.* (Diehl, frag. 48), are an answer to lines written by the sage Cleobulus on the tomb of Midas. Simonides being, as Plato calls him, *σοφὸς καὶ θεῖος ἀνήρ* (*Rep.* 331 *e*), was not afraid of attacking the Seven Sages on their own ground and disputing their most accepted apo-

¹ *Das Gedicht des Simonides in Platons "Protagoras"* (Christiania, 1888).

² Plato: "Protagoras," p. 200. ³ *Greek Melic Poets*, pp. 311-12.

⁴ *Sappho und Simonides*, pp. 159-83.

⁵ *The "Oedipus Tyrannus" of Sophocles*, p. xxxi.

thegms. Nor does what we know of him indicate that he held an unqualified brief for tyrants. He welcomed the death of Hipparchus and wrote (Diehl, frag. 76)

ἢ μέγ' Ἀθηναῖοισι φῶς γένεθ', ἡνίκ' Ἀριστο-
γείτων Ἰππαρχον κτεῖνε καὶ Ἀρμόδιος.

and what he respected in Archedice, daughter of Hippias, was that she οὐκ ἥρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην (Diehl, frag. 85).⁶ He was then afraid neither of controverting a famous saying nor of speaking his mind about tyrants. So here Simonides is not a sycophant but a sage. The explanation of the *σκόλιον* is that Scopas asks Simonides for his opinion on one ideal of manhood and Simonides answers with another; the ideal of Scopas is that of the ἑσθλὸς ἀνήρ popular among princes and aristocrats of the old order, while that proposed in its place by Simonides is the ideal of the ὑγιῆς ἀνήρ held by the surgent democracies and notably by Athens. To catch the proper intonations of Simonides' message we must go through the poem and examine the political and ethical associations of his words.

The opening is preserved by Plato:

ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι
χαλεπόν, χερσὶν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νοῷ
τετράγωνον ἀνευ φύγου τετυγμένον.

Simonides begins by saying that it is hard to become an ἀνήρ ἀγαθός, and so far he avoids controversial terms because every party claimed to have ἀρετά and to be ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί. Then follows the description of the particular type which it is hard to be, and the language reveals the aristocratic ideal familiar from Theognis and Pindar. The perfect man must be faultless physically—χερσὶν τε καὶ ποσὶ—and mentally—νοῷ, but his morality is not mentioned. The description is conventional and the words are catchwords. The combination of hand and mind is implicit in the words of the Medizing Timoereon who wrote of some unnamed man, ὃ ξυμβουλεύειν χέρσις ἀπὸ νοῦς δὲ πάρα,⁷ but this specific conception of excellence was often celebrated by the authentic poet of aristocracy, Pindar. He finds excellence of hands and feet naturally enough in his victorious athletes (*Pyth.* x. 23, χερσὶν ἡ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶ κρατήσαις), but also in their heroic prototypes such as Erginus (*Ol.*

⁶ Diehl classifies the epigram as *aetatis Simonideae*, but its Simonidean authorship is testified by Aristotle *Rhet.* 1. 8. 1387b.

⁷ Possibly Themistocles.

iv. 24–25, οὐτος ἐγὼ ταχυτάτι· χεῖρες δὲ καὶ ἥτορ ἵσον) and Achilles (*Isthm.* viii. 37, χεῖρας Ἀρεὶ τ' ἐναλίγκιον στεροπαῖσι τ' ἀκμὰν ποδῶν). He even goes farther and uses the combination of head and hand in his descriptions of ideal manhood such as Aiakos (*Nem.* viii. 8, χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος) and his enumerations of great qualities (*ibid.* ix. 39, χερσὶ καὶ ψυχῇ δυνατοί; *Pyth.* i. 42, καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ χερσὶ βιαταί). The conjunction of gifts was particularly dear to Pindar and formed an essential part of his notion of ἄρετά.

The kernel of the description lies in *τετράγωνον*. The “four-square” man is a creation of the Pythagoreans for whom the number 4 was sacred. Proclus (*Ad Eucl. Elem.* 48 G), speaking of *τὸ τετράγωνον*, says δοκεῖ τοῖς Πυθαγορείοις εἰκόνα φέρειν τῆς θείας οὐσίας, and the *τετράγωνος ἄνήρ* was the Pythagorean ideal of manhood. The Pythagoreans were more a religious than a political body, and their tenets were not specifically aristocratic.⁸ But in a later generation we know from Socrates’ affection for them that they tended to associate with the critics and opponents of democracy, and Diogenes Laertius’ account of the constitution established by Pythagoras at Croton leaves no doubt of its character.⁹ The leader gave the laws, and his followers περὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους ὄντες ὡκονόμουν ἄριστα τὰ πολιτικά, ὥστε σχεδὸν ἄριστοκρατίαν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν. At a time when their ideals were being questioned, the aristocracies found moral support in Pythagorean ideas and adopted their conceptions of excellence as appropriate to themselves.

The rest of the first stanza is missing, but it must have had some direct reference to Scopas. The second stanza marks a definite advance in the argument. Having said that the aristocratic ideal is difficult, Simonides goes a step farther and says that, strictly speaking, it is impossible.

οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον
νίμεται, καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὸ φωτὸς εἰ-
ρημένον· χαλεπὸν φάτ' ἐσθλὸν ἐμμεναι.
Θεῖς δὲ μόνος τοῦτ' ἔχοι γέρας, ἀνδρα δ' οὐκ
ἴστι μὴ οὐ κακὸν ἐμμεναι,
διν ἀμάχανος συμφορὰ καθέλῃ.
πράξας γάρ εὖ πᾶς ἀνήρ ἀγαθός,
κακὸς δ' εἰς κακῶς τι·
καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἄριστοι, τοὺς θεοὶ φιλέωντι.

⁸ Cf. J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 97.

⁹ viii. 3.

Here Simonides refuses to accept the saying of Pittacus because it does not seem to him ἐμμελέως εἰρημένον. The natural meaning of these words is that the saying is discordant or involves contradictions. It is πλημμελές. And this is what Simonides sets out to demonstrate. He takes the conventional notion of the ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ and shows that it does not work. The notion is of course familiar from the oligarchic and aristocratic poets. ἐσθλὸς is used almost *ad nauseam* by Theognis to describe himself and his friends, and Pindar uses it of the princes of Thessaly (*Pyth.* x. 69) no less than of Pelops (*Nem.* ii. 21) and Telephus (*Isth.* v. 41). By the end of the sixth century it had become a political label assumed by aristocrats in their struggles with the populace. For the identification of ἐσθλοί with the owners of property we need not look further than Theognis 31–36:

ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἔσθι· κακοῖσι δὲ μὴ προσομίλει
ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔχει·
καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν πίνε καὶ ἔσθιε, καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν
ἴζε, καὶ ἀνδανε τοῖς ὡς μεγάλῃ δίναμι.
ἐσθλῶν μὲν γάρ δέπτ' ἐσθλὰ μαθῆσει· οὐ δὲ κακοῖσι
συμμίσγης, ἀπολεῖς καὶ τὸν ἔντρα νόον.

Kyrnus is to avoid the *κακοί* and consort with the *ἐσθλοί*, who are those to whom great power belongs. The word that Homer used to describe general excellence has taken on a specifically political meaning. It is this notion which Simonides proceeds to criticize.

Simonides' first point is that God alone can have the privilege of being *ἐσθλός*, because if irresistible misfortune overtakes him, man is bound to be *κακός*. This has usually been taken to be Simonides' own opinion, and if it were, it would be evidence for his "ethics of the market-place."¹⁰ But nowhere else does Simonides express so low a view of the good man and nowhere else does he admit that misfortune is an insuperable obstacle to finding *ἀρετά*. On the contrary, his greatest praise is for those who in defeat and death have become ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί. He knows that *'Αρετά* dwells on rocks hard to climb but that with great effort she can be found,¹¹ and he knows too that *ἀπήμαντον οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις*.¹² If the words here are intended as an expression of personal opinion, Simonides is either inconsistent with himself or sycophantic. Either alternative is strange in the man whom the Greeks chose to celebrate their most heroic achievements, but

¹⁰ Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 312.

¹¹ Diehl, frag. 37.

¹² Diehl, frag. 10.

fortunately neither is necessary, because the words make excellent sense if taken as a *reductio ad absurdum* of a position which the poet is controverting. The point he makes is that the noble who claims to be *έσθλός* is bound sooner or later to find that he is *κακός*. In a world of political change the landowner may lose his lands and find that he is no better off than the laborers whom he has been taught to call *κακοί*. The truth of Simonides' point had already been realized by so good an oligarch as Alcaeus,

*ώς γάρ δήποτ' Ἀριστόδαμον φάεσ' οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Σπάρται λόγον
εἰπην, χρήματ' ἀνήρ, πένιχρος δ' οὐδὲ εἰς πέλετ' ξελος οὐδὲ τίμος,*¹³

and Theognis, who knew his own world well, drives the same point home (53–58):

*Κίρνε, πόλις μὲν θ' ίδε πόλις, λαοι δὲ δή δὲλλοι
οἱ πρόσθιοι οὐτε δίκας γένεσαν οὐτε νόμος,
ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ πλευραῖσι δοράς αἰγῶν κατέριβον
ξέω δ' ώστ' θλαφοι τῆροδ' ἐνέμοντο πόλεος.
καὶ νῦν εἰσ' ἀγαθοί, Πολυπαλήη· οἱ δὲ πρὶν έσθλοι
νῦν δειλοί. τίς κεν ταῦτη ἀνέχουτ' ξερῶν;*

The change which shocked and appalled Theognis, reversing, as it seemed, the order of nature, is accepted by Simonides as a fact and used in his attack on the view of *έσθλός* held by Pittacus and Scopas. In his opinion it is useless for a man to call himself *έσθλός* so long as circumstances can change him into a *κακός*. The old notion of nobility as something including good fortune had been proved by events to be no longer tenable. It was inconsistent with itself. Moreover, it was not an ethical ideal at all and therefore Simonides rejected it, but for the moment he was prepared only to show its inherent contradictions.

Simonides finishes his destructive analysis with the statement that "for the most part they are best whom the gods love." This has naturally been taken as his own opinion and as a counterpart of Pindar's view that *ἀγαθοί καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμονος ἄνδρες ἐγένοντο* (*Ol. ix. 28–29*). It was certainly a traditional Greek notion that a man's goodness or badness depended on the gods. Plato appropriately quotes an anonymous poet's line, *αὐτάρ ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς τότε μὲν κακὸς ἄλλοτε δ' ἔσθλός;*¹⁴ but Simonides did not share these views, nor was he such a fatalist as Pindar. Touched as he was by Ionian enlightenment, he attributed to human effort what others attributed to the gods. For

¹³ Lobel, frag. 122.

¹⁴ *Protag. 344d.*

him δακέθυμος ιδρώς will do what others attribute to θεία τύχη, and in the last words of this stanza he shows that the real weakness of the aristocratic position is that it attributes to divine Providence what is properly won by man's own efforts. The Greeks regarded ἀρετά as the essential quality of ἀγαθοί and ἄριστοι. Simonides had his own idea of what ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί were, as his lines on the fallen at Thermopylae show,¹⁵ and he was unwilling to accept a view which made ἀρετά simply a matter of εὐπραγία or good luck, still less to agree that the only test of an ἄριστος was the good fortune sent him by the gods. The last three lines of the stanza are a restatement of a view made to show how untenable that view is in that it attributes entirely to the gods what a man can do for himself with their help.

The third stanza clinches the conclusion of what Simonides has been saying and takes him on to his own constructive alternative.

τοῦνεκεν οὐποτ' ἐγώ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι
δυνατὸν διέζημενος κενέαν ἐς ἄ-
πρακτον ἐλπίδα μοῖραν αἰώνος βαλέω,
πατάμασμον ἀνθρώπων, εὑρεθόν δοτο-
καρτὸν αἰνύμεθα χονός.
Ἐπειτ' ὑμιν εἰρῶν ἀπαγγελέω
πάντας δ' ἐπαίνημα καὶ φιλέω,
ἐκών δοτις ἔρδη
μηδὲν αἰσχρόν ἀνάγκη δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.

The first part of the stanza is plain enough. Simonides is not going to waste his time in looking for an impossibly ideal man such as the aristocracies claim as their proper member. His elaborate language dresses his thoughts politely and prevents them from being offensive to his host, but there is something like irony in his statement that if he finds the "completely blameless man," he will proclaim his discovery. He knows, of course, that he will never find him. Then he goes on to state his own views, and they are very different from those he has been attacking. In the first place, the emphatic *πάντας* proclaims his humanity and tolerance in contrast with the problematical single specimen just described. His ideal is wider and more in touch with life than that. And, in the second place, for the whim of the gods he substitutes the effort of men. He likes and praises the man who does nothing *αἰσχρόν* willingly. In this statement two distinct points

¹⁵ Diehl, frag. 5.

must be noted: the emphasis on the doer's willingness and the meaning of *aiσχρόν*.

The emphasis on choice, *έκών*, recalls the conception of freedom of choice so emphatically stated and developed by Aeschylus. It is the essence of Prometheus' attitude when he refuses to apologize and says *έκών έκών ήμαρτον, οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι* (*PV* 268) and of the chorus' case against Aegisthus in the *Agamemnon* when they tell him *σὺ δ' ἄνδρα φῆς έκών κατακτανέν* (*Ag.* 1613). Even in Eteocles, the victim of an ancestral curse, the power to choose his end is stronger than his inherited malady and he goes of his own will to slay his brother.¹⁶ And at a crucial point of the *Eumenides* the correct reading may well be

*έκών¹⁷ δ' ἀνάγκας ἀτερ δίκαιος ὁ
οὐκ ἀνολθος ζοται* [550-51],

and the meaning is that the man who willingly chooses the right shall not be unhappy. On the other hand, such a notion is quite alien to Pindar and Theognis. They may see folly as the cause of evil but for them *ἀρετά* is essentially a gift of the gods.

The notion of *aiσχρόν* is equally Athenian and contemporary. For Pindar it meant "ugly" (*Isthm.* vii. 22, *ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἰσχίω φυᾶς*) and had no more a strictly ethical meaning than it had in Homer. But in Aeschylus *τὸ αἰσχρόν* has taken on an ethical meaning and is that which makes a man feel *αἰσχύνη*. The crucial passage is that where Eteocles describes Melanippus (*Sept.* 409-11):

*μάλ' εὐγενή τε καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνης θρόνον
τιμῶτα καὶ στυγοῦνθ' ὑπέρφρονας λόγους,
αἰσχρῶν γάρ ἀργός, μὴ κακὸς δ' εἶναι φιλέι.*

A similar idea is implied at *PV* 1039, *Septem* 685, *Ag.* 614. Already in Aeschylus *τὸ αἰσχρόν* has found the sense, which it bears commonly later, of that which gives a sense of shame. It was only a small step from this to the purely ethical sentiment of Euripides' *Bellerophon*, *εἰ θεοὶ τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοὶ* (Nauck, frag. 292). Simonides then had either anticipated or absorbed two important new ideas that were popular in fifth-century Athens. He made free will an important element in the good life, and he regarded abstention from *τὸ αἰσχρόν*, from what revolts the conscience, as indispensable.

¹⁶ Cf. M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*, p. 94.

¹⁷ *Έκών* is an emendation of Wieseler for the MSS reading of *ἐκ τῶν*'.

The stanza closes with the words "against Necessity not even the gods fight." This apothegm, often quoted in antiquity, is a fruit of the same enlightenment as the other opinions of Simonides. Homer, indeed, had made Zeus in some respects the inferior of the Fates (*Iliad* xvi. 433-58) and something of the same thought pervades Pindar's words in *Paean* vi. 93, *μόρσιμ' ἀναλίνειν Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν σκοπὸς οὐ τόλμα*. But the notion of Fate was itself theological, and when the Ionian scientists gradually removed the rule of the gods from the universe, they tended to remove Fate with them and to substitute the notion of *ἀνάγκη* for it. Thales is reported to have said *ἰσχυρότατον ἀνάγκη*, and his Ionian successors made *ἀνάγκη* almost the equivalent of natural law. So here Simonides' reservation is quite simple and straightforward. The order of things may occasionally force a man to act against what he thinks right. Life is a hard business and such things will happen, but when they do, even a god would give in. This is no morality of the second best, but an acceptance of the fact that conscience and the facts are sometimes discordantly confronted. For the aristocrats who held that a man's success depended on the gods' gifts, such a question hardly arose. He remained *ἀγαθός*. Simonides knew otherwise, and in this he was a child of his age. Herodotus (i. 91) makes the Pythia answer the envoys of Croesus with the words *τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδίνατά ἔστι ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῷ*, and he is transferring the scientific statement of *ἀνάγκη* into a religious setting with a religious vocabulary. But in another place he preserves a story from the Persian wars which shows the new ideas at work. When Themistocles demanded money from the men of Andros on the ground that the Athenians had two great gods, *Πειθώ τε καὶ Ἀναγκαῖην* (Hdt. viii. 111. 2), he used the language of an age which created gods out of the powers of nature, and he agreed with his admirer, Aeschylus, who made even the great *σοφιστής* Prometheus admit that *τέχνη δ' ἀνάγκης ἀσθενεστέρα μακρῷ* (PV 514). The sort of situation which Simonides contemplates is well illustrated by Sophocles. When Creon has done his utmost to enforce the law and found that nothing but disaster follows, he gives up his effort with the statement *ἀνάγκη δ' οὐχὶ δυσμαχητέον* (*Ant.* 1106). There is an element in nature which resists our best and strongest desires, and it is useless to fight against it.

The fourth stanza is fragmentary, and the text is uncertain, but the

drift is clear. In it Simonides takes his conception further and shows that the good man is essentially a good citizen and that the *ἀρετή* he advocates is essentially *πολιτική*.

οὕκ
εἰμ' ἔγώ φιλόμωμος· ἔξαρκεῖ γ' ἔμοι
δ τε μὴ κακός¹⁸ μηδ' ἄγαν ἀπάλαμνος, εἰ-
δὼς γ' ὄνησιπόλον δίκαν,
ὑγιῆς ἀνήρ. οὐδέ μή μν ἔγώ
μωμήσομαι· τῶν γάρ ἡλιθιων
ἀπείρων γενέθλα·
πάντα τοι καλά, τοῖσι τ' αἰσχρά μὴ μέμεικται.

The man of whom Simonides approves is the *ὑγιῆς ἀνήρ*, and here he presents a new political notion. For the old school, represented by Theognis and Pindar, *ὑγιῆς* means possessing good health and as such is applicable to the perfect man. But in Athens the word was turned to mean possessing health of mind and particularly political sanity. This is clear from Herodotus' use of *τὸ ὑγίαινον τῆς Ἑλλάδος* in the speech of the envoys to Gelon (vii. 158. 2) and from the chorus of the *Eumenides* who sing

εἰκ' ὁ ὑγιεῖς φρενῶν δ πάμφιλος
καὶ πολύευκτος δλβος.

The *Eumenides* is inspired with a deep political intention, and the chorus where the words occur (*Eum.* 535-37) proclaim the virtue of *δικά*. The same conception of political sanity recurs in Euripides in the negative form of *οὐδέντις ὑγιές* applied to the Spartans at *Andromache* 448, and when Sophocles wishes to make Philoctetes attack Odysseus for behaving treacherously and dishonorably, the words he puts in his mouth are *ω μηδὲν ὑγιές μηδ' ἐλεύθερον φρονῶν* (*Phil.* 1006). The notion of *ὑγιεία* as political sanity is primarily scientific and anticipates the medical analysis which Thucydides brought to history. It may even have its origin in the scientific movement which applied the language of the body to politics.

Political *ὑγιεία* is Simonides' ideal, and he is careful to explain and to qualify his annunciation of it. The words *εἰδὼς γ' ὄνησιπολιν δίκαν* make his meaning clear. There can be no *ὑγιεία* without a knowledge of what is politically *δίκαιον*. *δίκη* is right and proper behavior

¹⁸ I have written *δ τε μὴ κακός metri gratia*. The actual words are quite uncertain, though Plato's paraphrase, *δι μὴ κακός*, leaves no doubt about the sense.

toward gods or men, whether legal, moral, or social, and here Simonides defines what kind he wants. It must help the state. Simonides, in fact, anticipates the type of just man of whom Sophocles makes his chorus sing in *Antigone* 370-71, *νόμους περαίνων χθόνος, θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν· οὐψίολις*. There remain two other qualifications. His man must be neither *κακός* nor *ἄγαν ἀπάλαμπος*. These two qualifications anticipate objections from his hearers that if the main test of goodness is good intention, then the word good can be applied to men who clearly do not deserve it. The exception of the *κακός* is allowed because the true *κακός* is the opposite of the just-minded man. He is, as Sophocles says, *ἄπολις ὅτω τὸ μὴ καλὸν ξύνεστι τόλμας χάριν*. On the other hand, *ἄγαν ἀπάλαμπος* cannot be, as some have thought, the extreme type of criminal. To introduce such an idea is otiose after the mention of *κακός* and in any case absurd. The *ἄγαν ἀπάλαμπος* must be the half-wit unfit for social life. That the word can mean "feeble" we know from Hesychius' *ἀπάλαμπος* *ἀσθενής* *ἀμήχανος* and from Alcaeus' use of *οὐκ ἀπάλαμπον λόγον* (Lobel, frag. 122). Simonides' admission is almost a concession to his opponents. Strength of head and of hand was their great claim, and Simonides has to admit that the complete absence of both rules a man out from serious consideration. There are too many fools in the world, and sanity is what he asks for.

The conclusion is summed up in the words *πάντα τοι καλὰ τοῖσι τ' αἰσχρὸν μὴ μέμεικται*. Using the very comprehensive word *καλά* as a term of general approval, Simonides gives his blessing to everything which is not *αἰσχρὸν*. In the end he makes his point plain. He substitutes, as Wilamowitz says, the voice of conscience for the rule of *νόμος*. But he has already shown that in his opinion the conscience is most at home in a world whose ideals are singularly like those of Aeschylus and the Themistoclean age. So far from being a time-server, Simonides absorbed the constructive ideas of his generation and preached them boldly to ears which he may well have found deaf to such an ethical appeal.

TRACES OF AN INSULAR TRADITION IN THE ANCIENT SCHOLIA OF JUVENAL

BY BLANCHE B. BOYER

THE scholia of Juvenal, remarkably varied though of modest bulk, comprise two classes: the first, the greater part, dates from the close of the fourth century and, in spite of its being very corrupt, preserves some remnants of genuine ancient scholarship; the second, formerly designated the "Cornutus" commentary, probably belongs to the Carolingian age.

In the older group stand three separate items, the Bobbio and the Pithoean scholia and citations from the Probus of Valla. Among the palimpsest folia of Fronto in the Bobbio MS Vat. Lat. 5750 (Φ) is inserted one double leaf of the *Satires* of Persius (i. 53–110) and Juvenal (xiv. 323–xv. 43), written in capital letters of the late fourth century, with marginal scholia on Juvenal in sixth-century uncials *non nihil cursiuis et inclinati*.¹ These notes are not identical with others preserved elsewhere but they are of the same genre as the Pithoean. Manuscript authority for the latter consists of the two celebrated ninth-century codices of the *Satires*, Montepessulanus bibl. medicea H 125 (P) and Sangallensis 870 (S; olim D 476), and of five folia of the tenth or eleventh century, Fragmenta Arouiensia (Q), whose readings and format correspond precisely with those of P.² Related to this body, PSQ, was the collection once possessed by Georgius Valla, quoted in his edition of Juvenal (Venice, 1486), a commentary "Pro grammatici" extending only to viii. 198. But Valla's reference to this source is so meager as to render it negligible in the present discussion; its nature and the editorial method to which it was subjected have

¹ Ehrle-Liebaert, *Specimina codicum Latinorum Vaticanorum* (Bonae, 1912), p. xiv, tab. 6d.

² The common scholia of PS were first printed in Otto Jahn's edition of Juvenal (Berlin, 1851). Further items of P and a description of the four parts of S, together with a collation of the second part, "Excerpta," pp. 31–37 of the MS, are given in a dissertation, "De Pithoeanis in Iuuenalem scholiis," by Chr. Stephan (Bonae, 1882); a collation of the "Florilegium," pp. 6–31, of S is found in "Das prosodische 'Florilegium' der S. Gallener Handschrift nr. 870 und sein Wert für die Iuuenalkritik," by Chr. Stephan (*Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. XL [1885]), pp. 263–82. The Aarou fragments are discussed in "Handschriftliches zu Iuuenalis," by Hans Wirz, in *Hermes*, XV (1880), 437–48.

been deduced from a comparison with PS.³ Its attested variations probably are instances of (1) emendation required by the illegibility and corruption of the manuscript, (2) arbitrary improvement on the diction of the scholiast, and (3) intentional omission of superfluous words and phrases. The relatively few cases of agreement between this commentary and the scholia of the younger class, e.g., in Leidensis bibl. publ. No. 82 (L), Stephan attributed to the activity of a second hand transcribing in the "Probus" copy additional comment from an exemplar of the "Cornutus" type—an explanation which has been disputed in a recent critical edition by P. Wessner, who postulates instead a corpus γ as the *communis "Probi" et recentiorum fons*, thus removing the former from the ancient collections α (= Φ) and β (= PSQ, which he designates as π).⁴

For the undisputed members of β ($= \pi$) the presumption of Insular background is favored by the locale peculiar to each. P originated in the *scriptorium* of Lorsch, which, from its foundation in 764 by the archbishop of Metz, was in direct contact with English culture and assimilated certain scribal elements of Anglo-Saxon usage.⁵ S is a product of the school at St. Gall of Irish ancestry. Q is of unknown provenance; but it is, perhaps, significant that Q has been recovered in North Switzerland, and its likeness to P predisposes one to expect that it may corroborate any evidence in P, though unfortunately, because of its present fragmentary state, to a limited extent only.

The interrelation of PQS has been variously defined. Wirz⁶ pointed out the close agreement of PQ not only in text but in such minutiae as accidental slips and caprice in spelling. Yet, from the numerous original and faulty readings of Q, he deduced that Q was neither a copy of P (nor vice versa) nor a parallel descendant of P's exemplar but a transcription once removed from that original—and more closely related to S than to P. But Leo's view⁷ that Q is a gemellus of P is more acceptable; there is nothing in the citations from Q that demands

³ An account of Valla's MS forms chap. iii, pp. 26–73, of Stephan's dissertation.

⁴ *Scholia in Iuuenalem vetustiora*, ed. Paulus Wessner (Lipsiae in Aedibus: B. G. Teubneri, 1931), Praef. p. xxii; cf. stemma, Praef., p. xlivi.

⁵ W. M. Lindsay, "The (Early) Lorsch Scriptorium," *Palaeographia Latina*, Part III (1924), pp. 5–48.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 439, 440.

⁷ Ed. 1910, Praef., p. xx.

an intervening MS. Moreover, the list of readings reported by Wirz in support of a particular kinship between Q and the line of transmission represented by S is invalid because based on an imperfect collation of P; actually half are uniform in PQS, and the coincidence of the rest (QS *v.* P) is too casual to justify his conclusion. The position of S is clearly one of secondary dependence of the common archetype; its exemplar was a gemellus of PQS but palaeographically it seems more closely connected with the archetype.

PQ and S (Part *d*, pp. 40-326, the unique running commentary) share a common fault in the confusion of minuscule letters.⁹ There are innumerable instances of *u* written for *a* and vice versa in PS as well as some independent defections of the part of each of these three manuscripts. A few of the more striking cases are as follows: PS 74.22, *armiluusiam* for *armilausiam*; 87.8, *upoferetis* (-*tris* P) for *apophoretis*; 138.24, *uatubique* for *Batauique*; 187.8, *lauridum* (*luridum corr. lar-* P) for *laridum*; 118.7, *parapallium* for *per hypallegen*; P 37.17, *Perseam* 111.1, *sutor nise secum stilla* for *Saturni sese cum stella*; 179.28, *urce* for *arce*; 196.27, *nabem corr. ex nuvem* for *nauem*; S 42.21, *munere* for *manere*; 43.12, *delficum*; 74.14, *ananimis corr. unanimis*; 186.18, *exibitusr osā corr. -sū* for *exibiturus sum*; Q 97.3, *erubescant*; 128.18, *stationam*.¹⁰ Other errors include: *r* for *ti*: 2. 6, *erant* PS¹ *erat* S² for *etiam*; *a* for *ci*: 133.19, *grammatia* S; *b* for *h*: 75.2, *debes peridis* PS for *de Hesperidis*; *u* for *n*: 42.2, *tempore suo uilem* PS for *temporis nobilem*; *r* for *t*: 16.10, *ponere* P for *pone te*; *t* for *r*: 174.23, *potentur* PS for *ponentur*; *s* for *t*: 155.5, *inclinans* S; 155.16, *adiuvas* S; *n* for *t*: 128.8, *lacernae* PQS for *Lacertae*.

It was, then (ninth-century?), Caroline minuscule which furnished copy for PQS; but back of that lay an archetype in Insular script. This fact is evidenced by several features—peculiar letter confusion,

⁸ Wessner, Praef., p. xii: "Deducimur autem ut his erroribus, ita multis aliis rebus ad eam opinionem, ut exemplar codicis Sangallensis libro Laurishemensi (item Arouensi) sicut ouum ouo fuisse simillimum existimemus."

⁹ What follows is based on Wessner's text supplemented by a new collation of S generously placed at my disposal by Professor C. H. Beeson. To him I am indebted also for notice of specific abbreviations other than those recorded by Wessner.

¹⁰ Wessner recognizes that in this interchange of *a* and *u* there is evidence of an open letter *a* such as is used also by the scribe of S. He questions whether the presence of open *a* in Codex *π*, the common forerunner of PQS, may corroborate his guess of early ninth century as the date of *π*, Praef., p. xvi. He does not remark the possibility that this letter *a* may be Insular.

characteristic orthography, errata arising from the misunderstanding of abbreviations, and the retention of a few symbols in PS.

The Insular letter *f* is a source of repeated error; it is mistaken for *p* and for *s* and in turn it replaces each of these:¹¹ 18.15 ff., *professus*] *percessus* PS; 76.9, *fulcri*] *pulchri* PS; 108.13, *f.*] *p.* PS; 146.11, *sardanapallo*] *fallo* P; 182.8, *petat* Lach.] *ferat* PS (influenced by *praeferat* following); 57.5, *qui fiunt* Orelli] *qui sui* ut S *quisui* ut P; 203.23, *forti*] *sorti* S; 220.21, *futile* Cram.] *subtili* PS; 42.6, *si eris*] *fueris* PS; 145.20, *desine* Cram.] *defini* PS; 185.16, *deserere* Cram.] *deferre* PS; 195.1, *sortis*] *fortis* S. In an exchange that is facilitated by the typical short-shafted or backward-slanting minuscule *h* of Irish and Anglo-Saxon manuscripts,¹² *n* occurs for *h*; 20.9 and 110.12, *haec*] *nec* PS; 173.31, *hoc et Leo*] *nocet* PS. The letter *i* is displaced by *l*, a confusion that is equally possible in a majuscule script and in a minuscule which employs *I-longa*; here it is to be observed that an erroneous *l* nearly always stands in the place where *I-longa* would be normal in Insular writing: 32.13, *iocari*] *locari* PQS; 124.11, *Pierio*] *Plerio* PS; 135.16, *iactitant*] *lact-* P; 147.19, *iocos*] *locos* P; 151.22 and 203.9, *cuius*] *culus* P; 153.25, *Lucilius*] *lucullus* P *lucillus* S¹; 154.7, *iocis*] *locis* PS; 156.18, *En cui tu*] *incultu* PS; 181.20, *objectio*] *obl-* P; 194.6, *Iuxta*] *luxta* S; 214.21, *Caieta*] *caleta* PS. Especially significant is the extensive characteristic Insular confusion of *n*, *p*, *r*; *p* and *r* for *n*: 181.22, *uoluntate*] *uoluptate* S *uolumptate* P; 187.19, *incensuram*] *incepsuram* PS; 65.20, *uinum*] *uerum* PS; 67.7, *Fauoni*] *fauori* S *fauor* P; *n* for *p*: 145.15, *popinae*] *ponine* S; 169.10, *preces sed Wessner*] *necesse est et* PS; 222.2, *uoluptatem*] *uoluntatem* PS; *n* for *r*: 17.13, *tarde*] *tande* S; 26.6, *libidinosi reprehensio*] *libido sine reprehensione* PS; 67.11, *cur scriptum*] *conscriptum* PS; 81.2, *galero*] *galeno* PS; 159.24, *Hallirrothion*] *palinrothion* PS; 219.19, *pauore*] *pabonē* PS; 228.4, *redargueret*] *redarguent* PS. Likewise *r* substitutes for *p*: 58.13, *diripuissent* Valla] *deseruisse* PS; 88.21, *pudorem* Orelli] *ruborem* PS; 143.24 *ephebus*] *erebus* PS; and *p* for *r*: 193.32, *rarior*] *parior* PS. Also there is interchange of *r* and *s*, which is often seen in Continental transcriptions of Insular minuscule; *s* for *r*: 32.10, *fossas* PQS for *foras*; 137.8, *uisum* PS for *uirum*; 217.15, *se* PS for *re*; 220.25, *fortis* S for *fertur*; *r* for *s*: 84.10, *incertum* Q; 166.13, *senatura* P for *senatus a.*

¹¹ The confusion of *p* and *f* is possible also in a majuscule archetype.

¹² Cf. fol. 59r of MS Pal. Lat. 195, Pl. IX of *Palaeographia Latina*, Part III (1924).

In the matter of spelling also there are Insular traits; inconsistency in the use of the aspirate and doubling and dropping of consonants, of which the most important item is misuse of the letter *s*, e.g., 50.13, *excisus* PS; 24.13, *issiaca* PS; 59.19, *Pegasus* PS.

Certain wrong readings are the result of misinterpretation of abbreviations, some clearly Insular, others merely compatible with Insular conditions. The former include:

181.4 *hunc Silium* Wessner] *hostilium* PS. Here the scribe of π evidently mistook *h̄c* in his exemplar for *ho*. . . .

Some of the *q*-series of symbols: *quod* for *quea* in PQS at 33.12, 84.20, and 96.20 is perhaps due to the presence of *que* for *quea*, denoted by an ancient *Nota* resembling Insular *quod* (with sinuous stroke)¹³ and so transcribed in the Insular parent of π . Perhaps it was this same "early Continental symbol," but with a straight shaft, like Insular *quam*, that caused *quam* for *quea* at 161.20 PS. Similarly, *quem dum* for *quaedam*, 181.2 PS, may be the result of misinterpreting the ancient *Nota* *q̄* (= *quea*) as Insular *q̄* (= *quem*). Uncertainty with regard to the Insular symbols for *quod* and *quia* may have led π to substitute *quia* for *quod* at 26.1, 47.19, 78.13, 93.6, and 123.5. In place of *quod* also are found in PS *quea* at 45.15, 231.3, and *quam* at 142.22, 150.2, 155.6, 208.3. Conversely, for *quea* stands *quod* at 33.12, 84.20, 96.20 (all from π), *quam* at 123.2 P, 180.2 P; for *quam* occurs *qui* at 64.16, *quea* at 59.17, 85.27, *quod* at 67.7, 226.6, *quia* at 80.10, 120.19, *quem* at 61.12, 139.19, 195.3 (cf. *quam* for *quea* at 26.23 PS, 63.4 S) from the contraction *qm̄* for both *quam* and *quem*, cited by Lindsay from several Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; *usquam* appears as *usque* at 203.16 and *quisque* as *quisquam* at 132.10. The most frequent error of this series in π is *qui* for *quia*, 27.9, 66.25, 79.27, 157.5, 163.25, 171.19, 172.8, 186.6, 194.22, 215.22; *quea* replaces *quia* once, 216.14, *quam* several times, 152.27, 157.1, 176.5, 212.22, 213.24.

69.2 *sed] sunt* PS. Insular *s* (*sed*) was mistaken by π for Continental *s* (*sunt*).

59.16 *sunt] est* PS. The reading of PS, *nulla est occultior res* for *nullae sunt occultiores*, is due to imperfect word-division and the presence of *st* for *sunt* in the Insular exemplar of π .

83.17 *depicta est] depictae sunt* (*st* S) QS *depictaest* P. S here preserves the abbreviation which an Insular scribe read into the juxtaposition of *st* in his exemplar; if previous to π , then the correct reading in P results from oversight of the abbreviation stroke; if subsequent to π , then in the predecessor of S, and the agreement of QS is not fortuitous.

14.10 and 60.11 *tamen] tum* PS. π failed to recognize Insular *t̄n* (= *tamen*) in his exemplar and confused it with *t̄u* (= *tum*).

¹³ Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 228.

The most common and one of the most interesting cases of confusion in the π family is that which has resulted in the substitution of *uel* for *uel*. It follows from the identical form of the ancient *Notae* for these two words, \bar{u} . This symbol for *uel* is recognized to be, as early as the eighth century, "if not obsolete, at least old-fashioned, and is mainly preserved in the traditional usage of the glossaries,"¹⁴ but aside from any consideration of these, its preservation otherwise seems largely, if not wholly, due to Insular activity.¹⁵ Its currency in Bobbio, a name synonymous with Insular productivity, was of longer duration than elsewhere; Lindsay cites it from the Naples Charisius and Vienna 16 and 17, Milan C 105 inf., Vienna 954, Florence Ashb. 60, and Vat. Lat. 491. Like *uel*, *ut* survived in the Bobbio *scriptorium* until the middle of the eighth century in the form of the ancient *Nota* \bar{u} . It has been preserved in Milan L 99 sup. and Vienna 954; and it has been blindly transmitted through the Anglo-Saxon scribe of Boulogne 63-64. In view of all these facts, it seems a reasonable assumption that interchange of the words *uel* and *ut* in mediaeval manuscripts is a sign of Insular lineage.

There are other errors involving abbreviation in PQS which, though not conclusive Insular evidence, are consistent with the foregoing:

110.10 *cuius] cum* PS. Three forms of explanation are possible: (1) *cui \bar{z}* (\bar{z} = Insular syllable symbol for *-us*) confused with *cuz* (\bar{z} = Continental *m*-stroke); (2) Insular $\bar{c}\bar{s}$ misread as $\bar{c}\bar{u}$, as at 147.21 PS read *quamuis* for *quasi* similarly ($\bar{q}\bar{s}$ mistaken for $\bar{q}\bar{u}$?); (3) *c' = cuius* (not in any extant legal manuscript, according to Lindsay, but in a mediaeval *laterculus*), identified with the ancient *Nota* for *cum*. The latter actually occurs in Naples IV A 8, Brussels 10127-41, Paris 528 (Limoges, s. IX), along with many Insular abbreviations, and Vat. Reg. 316 (Sacramentarium Gelasianum) in like company.

35.8 and 113.3 *id est]* in PQS. This substitution may be due to an unfamiliar (or carelessly written) $\cdot i$ in the archetype of π .

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

¹⁵ Cf. the citations *ibid.* With a single exception, viz., Paris 4403 B s. VIII, they are known to have Insular connections; Oxford Hatton 48 Rule of St. Benedict (Kent? uncial), London Cotton Tib. A XV Junilius (Anglo-Saxon script, s.VIII), St. Omer 342 bis flyleaf (St. Bertin, Anglo-Saxon script, s.VIII/IX), Brussels 10127-41 Canons (Ghent, s.VIII) product of a *scriptorium* under Insular influence, Amiens 10 Liber Esdrae (Corbie, s.VIII/IX) which contains also *k*, *l*, *m*, Berlin Phillips 1743 Concilia (Rheims s. VIII) containing also *st*; Cologne 55 Jerome (Cologne s.VIII/IX), Epinal 6 Pelagius (Moyenmoutier, s.IX), Paris 1853 Jerome (Murbach, s. VIII/IX), Berlin Phillips 1831 Bede (Verona s.IX), Paris, 7530 (Beneventan script s.VIII ex.), all showing other Insular abbreviations.

81.4 *ideo] id est* PS. This may, perhaps, be an indication of an ancient *Nota* for *ideo* (*id*), analogous to the form peculiar to one (Irish?) of the many hands of Cologne 83 II, "if," as Lindsay remarks, "this is no mere capricious suspension but an ancient *Nota* preserved."¹⁶

The occurrence of *non* for *nam* in PS at 26.14, 32.10, 54.12 and *nam* for *non* at 112.9, 140.6, 162.27, 187.5, 192.28, also *non* for *nihil* at 36.1, is likewise conceivably due to Insular predilection for ancient symbols: the ancient *Nota* for *nam* presents a varied appearance in Milan C 301 inf., Cambridge Iuuenus, Corpus Martianus Capella, Carlsruhe Priscian, Bern C 219, Vat. Reg. 81 (transcribed from Insular script);¹⁷ the monogram for *nihil* is quoted by Lindsay from only Boulogne 63-64 and Bern 207 (of Insular derivation and Irish-Continental penmanship); in a Bobbio manuscript, Milan C 98, it resembles the ancient *Nota* for *nisi*. In Cologne 41, which contains numerous Insular abbreviations, *nisi* is reported consistently used for *non* by the scribe of folios 1r-16v.

At 227.2 Wessner repeats a curious error of Jahn's involving the monogram *S* (an Insular trait) for *si*, which word Wessner prints as his own emendation of the reading of PS, reported by Jahn as *g* and represented by Wessner as *.G.* in S and *g* in P. In reality, however, the letter-form in S is not *.G.* but *ꝝ*. Presumably *π* transmitted the monogram in an uncorrect or unfamiliar form, which the copyist P transcribed as *g* and the scribe of S imitated. *Φ* at this point (*Sat. xv. 13*) apparently supports the reading *si*.¹⁸

To the evidence derived from error in the understanding and representation of abbreviated forms in a common source should be added some consideration of the possible significance of other abbreviations in the several dependants. In the present instance, the fragment Q offers nothing of importance. Among the comparatively few items in P are Insular *enim* (+), an interlinear (secondhand?) addition on folio 16r (Wessner 16.17: S writes *ey* here and again at 43.14), and the syllable contraction *rl* of Insular origin, folio 48r *spoliauert* and folio 71v *tradiderl*.¹⁹ S exhibits numerous similar traits, some pre-

¹⁶ *NL*, p. 110.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁸ F. Nougaret, *Vaticanus MS 5750; Perse-Juvenal, Mélanges offerts à Louis Havet* (Paris, 1909), p. 319.

¹⁹ Only the abbreviations of the Pithorean scholia are cited. Others in tenth-century hands include the following: fol. 13v 7, +, *omia*, *•i*, *g*; fol. 14v *nc*; fol. 19v, 60v, 80r *dr*; fol. 20r *q* (*quia*); fol. 21r *qm*; fol. 25r *h* *p* *cio* (*hoc pretio*); fol. 28r *pp*, fol. 48v *pt*, fol. 30v *tc*; fol. 39r *qndo*.

sumably survivals. Among the common contractions of Insular origin are *đl* and *đx* (replaced by *dic* and *dix*, respectively, in a single instance) and *dnl*. Insular *est* (÷) supplants the usual Continental abbreviation (ē) once; it stands twice with *id* (*id* ÷) alongside the ambiguous forms *iđ* and *idē*. Equally significant is the unique symbol *h·ē* (*hoc est*), analogous to Insular *i÷* and *i·* (*id est*), whether it be a Continental imitation of Insular method or an actual retention of Insular *h* (*hoc*).²⁰ There is found also the Insular contraction *hōes* for *homines*. Infrequency of the conventional *m*- or *n*-stroke makes more conspicuous the otherwise negligible form *l̄* used once as the preposition and once as prefix in the compound-word *indigestione*; it is, I suggest, a probable instance of the Insular prepositional symbol (= the ancient *Nota*) retained from the postulated Insular archetype II. *Inquit* appears four times as Insular *inqt* (once corrected by a second-hand addition of suprascript *i*). Insular *qq̄* is consistently used for *quoque*; Insular *q·* appears twice for *quae*, beside the commoner *q̄*; *quoniam* is indifferently represented by Anglo-Saxon *q̄uo* or Irish *qm̄* (once by *q̄niā*), but not by *qñ* or *qñm* as might be expected in a manuscript of the kind and age of S—possibly because S has inherited the first two as well as its recurrent Insular *qñ* for *quando*. Continental *s̄* (*sunt*) is less frequent than Insular *sl̄*. *Tamen* and *tantum* are invariably Insular *tñ* and *tñ̄*, respectively, except for a single substitution of *tañ̄* for *tñ*.

Many irregular and arbitrary abbreviations stand in PQS, e.g., *Hylas*] *hyt* S *hy*. P; 95.19, *unde*] *i.d.* PQS; 102.20, *elenchos*] *e.* PQ; 105.11, *quae*] *q.* P; 110.19, *quid*] *q.* P; 126.15, *tu*] *t.* S; 147.11, *uelox*] *uex* S *u.* P; 166.24, *probauit*] *pba* S *p.b.* P; 207.17, *omnibus*] *o.n.b.* P; 212.17, *qui*] *q.* S; 212.25, *quae*] *q.* S *q.* P; 213.16, *quae*] *q.* S *-q.* P. But such idiosyncrasies serve only to heighten the significance attaching to those other abbreviations above, common to PQS, which, in my opinion, represent an Insular heritage however imperfectly preserved.

Parts *a* and *b* of S, the “Florilegium” and “Excerpta,” respectively, in their brief compass likewise offer a few unmistakable symptoms of this Insular background. The “Florilegium” is a miscellany of 459

²⁰ Lindsay (*NL*, p. 101) cites *h÷* (for *hoc est*: but the *h* without the dot at the right) from Paris 1853, an eighth-century MS from Murbach (?), along with many characteristic Insular abbreviations including *h̄*, *h̄·*, *loḡ*, *tñ*, *tñ̄*.

hexameter verses of varied authorship and date. Approximately three-fifths are from Juvenal, with a dozen scholia and several scattered glosses. The scholia are like those of PS but are not identical in phrasing.²¹ Insular *i.* and *l* are conspicuous here; an Insular abbreviation for *nomen* (*nō*) occurs in vi. 243, *Manlia pnō femine* (where PS read *nomen mulieris*); in common with PS at vi. 120 *galero* is misspelled *galeno*, and similarly at iii. 234 *meritoria* appears as *mentoria*. In the lemmata, moreover, stand these abbreviations: x. 356, \div ; xiv. 122, *pagant*; xv. 166, *t̄m* (*tantum*). The "Excerpta" are a small collection of scholia. Between the twenty-seven items from Juvenal and their equivalents in PS there is the same degree of variation that holds in the case of the "Florilegium"; but there is as well a single instance of agreement in error with S at vi. 343, *ipsum* for *istud*. Abbreviations include *i.* and *l*.

Both the "Excerpta" and the "Florilegium" are in the same hand as the body of scholia in S and derive, doubtless, from the same source, viz., a lost (St. Gall?) manuscript, sister to PQ. The comparatively numerous Insular features of this link between π and S, if not all survivals, may conceivably be due to chance incorporation of a few national forms by an Insular copyist of St. Gall in transcribing the Caroline minuscule manuscript π .

But whatever the explanation of their prominence in S, the few demonstrable survivals of PS and the many common errors transmitted to PQS by π establish for π an Insular archetype II (VII/VIII?).

In view of the widespread transcription of classical manuscripts during the ninth century, it would be surprising if likewise a trace of Insular interest should not appear also in some member of the *recentiores*. This younger body of scholia has none of the uniformity of

²¹ E.g., iii. 234 PS *Meritoria: taberna ab eo quod mercedes praestat.*

a Mentoria tabna eo qd mercedes p̄stat l a mero

iii. 251 PS *Corbulo uix: alii dicunt athletam illius temporis*

fortem Corbulonem fuisse, alii genus nauis.

a Corbulus. quidā athletā fortē. alii genus nauis

v. 59 PS *Gaetulum: Maurum*

a getulus. maurus

vi. 156 PS *pocula de murra tincta facta*

a pocula de myrra tincta l facta

the older; but Wessner has affirmed a general cleavage into two classes, ϕ and χ , though very few manuscripts belong exclusively to either.²² The diversity of comment in these scholia necessitated their restriction in Wessner's supplementary apparatus to such as pertained to his thesis of a common source for these and the readings of Valla. For two of the manuscripts of mixed origin which he enumerated but did not record in the apparatus, there are signs of an Insular intermediary. Vaticanus Urb. 342, saec. X, contains (fols. 1–76) the text of Juvenal written with almost no abbreviations, but in the scholia (and glosses) several are used, among them the following significant symbols: \overline{ap} , $d\bar{n}r$, $dict$, \pm , 7, \hat{g} , $\cdot\hat{i}\cdot$, \bar{i} , $\bar{h}t$, $h\bar{n}t$, h (hoc), $ho\bar{e}s$, \hat{m} , \hat{m} , $\bar{n}c$, \hat{q} , \hat{q} , \hat{q} , q (quam), qdo and $qndo$ (quando), $\bar{q}si$ (quasi), $\bar{s}t$, \hat{t} , \bar{t} and $u\bar{l}$, \bar{u} . Vindobonensis 277, a miscellany of 93 folia, saec. IX–XVI, offers on folios 1–40 a commentary, saec. X, on *Satires* i–iv and vi. 32–217. In this narrow scope a similar set of abbreviations is frequent, viz.: \overline{ap} , $\bar{d}t$, $d\bar{r}$, $d\bar{n}r$ (also $dic\bar{s}$ and $di\bar{n}r$), \div , \pm , 7, \hat{g} , $\bar{h}t$, $h\bar{n}t$, $h\bar{n}s$, $ho\bar{e}s$, h (haec), h (hoc) and h (hoc), $\cdot\hat{i}\cdot$, \hat{m} , \hat{m} , $\bar{n}c$, $n\bar{r}a$, \hat{p} , \hat{p} , q (quam), \bar{q} (quae), $\bar{q}m$ (quoniam), $\bar{q}si$ (quasi), $aliqdo$ and $qndo$, $\bar{s}t$, $\bar{t}c$, \bar{t} and $u\bar{l}$, \bar{u} .

Moreover, in another codex of the tenth century, omitted by Wessner though a related manuscript (Vat. Urb. 661, saec. XI) was included in his list, there was actual participation by a contemporary Insular scribe. MS Paris 7900 A,²³ whose Juvenal text belongs to the interpolated group of manuscripts, shows annotation by an Anglo-Saxon hand of both Horace²⁴ and Juvenal. The only important marginal scholia of the latter are (fol. 100) a carefully penned detailed

²² *Editio*, pp. xxiii–xxxii. Of p, the secondhand corrector of P, Wessner observes (p. xxviii) that at first his marginal notes seem allied to ϕ , then to χ .

²³ The contents are: fols. 1–26, Terence; fols. 27–56, Horace (*Carm.*, *Ep.*, *Epist.* i); fols. 57–94, Lucan; fols. 95–111, Juvenal (*Sat.* i–xv. 174); fols. 112–55, Martianus Capella—each accompanied by a commentary.

²⁴ Not mentioned by Keller, who says of this MS ([ed. 1899; Teubner], p. xiii): "In *carm.* et *epod.* A [Paris 7900 A] praeter Horatium Pseudoacronis quoque uetustissimam omnium elegantissimamque exhibet recensionem, et est huius antiquitatis monumenti codex longe praestantissimus." On fol. 52v, following the commentary of Pseudo-Acorn on Epode xiv, there is a 22-line paragraph in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, consisting of the scholia of Porphyrius on Epode xv, complete but with heading and lemma (l. 1, which the Insular hand repeated) in the same Caroline minuscule that precedes and follows.

expositio of *Sat.* vi. 1-4, such as is not found elsewhere,²⁵ and (fol. 101v) a running commentary at the left of each of the two columns containing *ibid.* 293-390. Interlinear glosses by the same hand are scattered throughout the *Satires*, which are likewise glossed by the Carolingian scribe who wrote the text. An admixture of Continental and Insular abbreviations is used by the Anglo-Saxon commentator, as expected of one so late. Of his national type, only *d̄t*, *t*, *q̄*, *qt* (but with *o sscr.*), *st̄*, *ū*, occur in the scholia, and in the glosses, *cāp̄* (on the analogy of *āp̄*), *÷*, *±*, *·i*, *h̄*, *h̄v*, *h̄l*, *h̄ns*, *hōs*, *hōis*, *-t̄* (*lis*), *ṁ*, *ṁ̄*, *nōa*, *p̄nō*, *q̄*, *q̄t*, *q̄*, *t̄c*. But there is a hint of previous Insular influence on this copy of the *Satires*, as in fact for the other authors in this compilation, in the presence of pertinent symbols in the text: *āp̄*, *±*, *ḡ*, *h̄*, *h̄* (also *h̄ē* for *hoc est*), *ṁ*, *nōa*, *n̄c*, *q̄*, *q̄*, *q̄m̄*, *t̄*.

Further, there is other evidence that Insular activity was not confined to the scholia of Juvenal. In a manuscript fragment probably older than P, Vienna 107, saec. IX, containing *Sat.* i-ii. 59, ii. 107-v. 96, appear a number of Insular characteristics, such as actual abbreviation symbols, errors due to confusion of letters, and the orthography usual in Insular script, as follows:

- (1) *est*] *÷*, *haec*] *h̄* (the same for *hoc* once), *modo*] *ṁ*, *quam*] *q* (the same for *qui* once), *sed*] *š*, *uel*] *ul*, *l* (the second involved once in a wrong reading, *eglo cluividens* for *ego uel cluuiens*), *-runt*] *̄t*, *uer*] *ū*;
- (2) *u* for *a*: ii. 138, *nequeant*] *nequent*; iii. 271 *cadant*] *cadunt*; *f* for *p*: ii. 151, *par materiae*] *formateria corr.*; iii. 28, *porto*] *forto*; *s* for *p*: i. 141, *ponit* *apros*] *ponitas pos*; ii. 50, *morbo pallet*] *morbos allet*; ii. 29, *tragico pollutus*] *tragi cos uellutos*; iii. 209, *perdidit*] *Pserdidit*; *s* for *r*: iii. 266, *porthmea*] *post mea*; *p* for *r*: iii. 13, *antistes rarum*] *antistite sparum*; *p* for *s*: ii. 50, *Hippo* or *Hispo*] *hisppo*; *in* for *si*: i. 71, *sitiente*] *intient-*;
- (3) inconsistency in the use of the aspirate: *atenis, conce, hodie minor*] *odiem inor, ummero, cheromatico, eufrathen, nephas*; doubling and dropping of consonants: *ferrocem, Lachesi*] *lacessi, nassus, pegassus, acusator, grasa- tor, longisimus, possit*] *posis*.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

²⁵ One of several *lacunae scholiorum uetustiorum* occurs in *π* at this point (*Sat.* vi. 1-6); also at v. 172, 173; viii. 129-58; xvi. 46-60.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

CODICES LIBRARIORUM

Asconius (p. 29 [Kiessling-Schoell]) in the Introduction to his commentary to Cicero's *Pro Milone*, in describing the burning of the body of Clodius in the senate house, uses the following expression: "cremavitque subselliis et tribunalibus et mensis et codicibus librariorum." The material of the funeral pile therefore consisted of the settees of the senators and tribunes, the raised platforms on which the presiding magistrates sat, tables used by magistrates and scribes, and finally *codices librariorum*.

Appian (*B.c.* ii. 3) partially confirms this picture of the funeral pile by naming *τὰ βάθρα καὶ τὸν θρόνον βουλευτῶν*, the settees and chairs of the senators. Dio xl. 48 mentions only the settees. The *codices librariorum* have been variously interpreted as the "books of the secretaries," or "of the book-sellers," or "of the bookshops." Recently Schubart (*Das Buch bei den Griechern und Römern*, p. 114) interprets as "die Aktenbände der Senats-schreiber" and assumes that this is the earliest mention of parchment books bound in the form that later became regular. Against this view may be urged that inflammable and compact material was needed to complete a funeral pile consisting of settees, platforms, tables, and chairs, even if these pieces of furniture were considerably broken up. But parchment manuscripts are not only not readily inflammable but are actually hard and slow to burn even in a hot fire. A few years ago I published a *Beatus* manuscript from the Royal Library in Turin that had survived two fires. The manuscript had been rebound, so the covers were doubtless badly burned, and the edges of the leaves were scorched or shriveled on all sides, but except for a few stains the manuscript was still entirely legible. We may rest assured that a lot of parchment manuscripts would not have added to the inflammability of the funeral pile, but would have reduced it. Yet this funeral fire was so big and hot that it set fire to the senate house and destroyed it. By this assumption of the inflammability of parchment manuscripts Schubart outstrips Abulfaragio, who in the ninth century told of using books, perhaps papyrus, as fuel. This oft repeated story was that the Arabs distributed the books of the Serapeum Library in Alexandria to the public baths, for which they furnished fuel for six months. Now in A.D. 640 there would have been some papyrus books in an Egyptian library. However, as Orosius (vi. 15. 32) tells us that he saw the ruins of the library in the temples which had been sacked and destroyed just before his time (A.D. 400), the story of Arab vandalism was probably an invention of the ninth century, when papyrus books were most rare even in Egypt.

How, then, shall we interpret *codices librariorum* in the Asconius passage? There can be little doubt that Schubart is right in his assumption that the notebooks of the senate clerks are meant. There were no bookshops in the senate house and if the plunder of bookshops had been brought in from the neighboring streets, such books would not have been called *codices* but *libri*. I believe that Seneca (*De brevitate vitae* xiii. 4) gives us the proper clue. He defines *caudex* as *plurium tabularum contextus*, "a joining in book form of several wax tablets," and adds the statement, "*publicae tabulae codices dicuntur.*"

When we recall the conservative character of the Romans, and consider the ease with which such *codices* could be numbered and filed on shelves placed against a wall, it seems a reasonable assumption that the original wax-tablet notebooks, on which the discussions and decrees of the senate were taken down by clerks, might have been preserved in the senate house after they had furnished the material for the committee to draw up the official form of the decree for deposit in the treasury. Such wax tablets would have furnished a compact and inflammable material to add to the loose pile of tables, chairs, and settees. If the tablet records of the senate were preserved for even a year or so the material would have been abundant.

It is not, however, entirely impossible that papyrus *codices* had already in 52 B.C. replaced the wax tablets for the senate records, for the discovery of the Beatty papyri, fragments of twelve manuscripts in codex form, one of which is dated in the second century A.D., carries that form of the papyrus book well back in the history of the Christian church. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the Christian church in its poor and illiterate beginnings invented this new form of the book. It had been invented in the form of tablets and changed to parchment or papyrus leaves so as to be used for longer records and for lawbooks before the Christians felt the need of a book form adapted to easy reference.

HENRY A. SANDERS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

STRATONICEIA AND ARISTONICUS

Before the Romans could take possession of the kingdom willed to them in 133 B.C. by Attalus III of Pergamum, they found their right contested by a pretender, Aristonicus, an illegitimate son of the previous king. A war ensued, at the close of which, according to Eutropius (iv. 20) and Orosius (v. 10. 1), Aristonicus was besieged and captured by the Roman general Perperna at a city named Stratoniceia. Niese¹ held that this city was Stratoniceia on the Caicus in Lydia, but Foucart² because of the contemporary unrest in Caria re-

¹ *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, III, 369.

² *Mémoires de l'Acad.*, XXXVII (1903), 297-339; esp. p. 335.

vealed by an inscription of Bargylia asserted that it must be the well-known city of Stratoniceia in Caria. He has been followed by Radet,³ Cardinali,⁴ and others, and by Holleaux⁵ in his recent revision of the inscription. Precision on this point is of some value for our understanding of the course of operations in the war.

It is an undoubted fact that there was serious unrest in Caria. Myndus was captured by Aristonicus early in the war.⁶ Halicarnassus raised levies to aid the Roman forces,⁷ and the inscription of Bargylia, which mentions Manius Aquilius, governor of Asia from 129 to 126 B.C., shows that levies were raised there for a considerable period of time and became very burdensome, and that the Romans kept a standing army there because Caria was not yet completely pacified. But disturbances were equally general in the north. Sestus was troubled by a sympathetic movement of the Thracians,⁸ and Cyzicus by raids,⁹ probably of the hillmen of Mysia Abbaitis. The disturbance was so widespread that evidence of trouble in Caria or even of the presence of Aquilius there¹⁰ is not enough to prove that the Carian city was the pretender's refuge.

Furthermore, it appears that the military strength of Aristonicus was chiefly based on the region of Lydia in which Stratoniceia on the Caicus lies. After being defeated at sea near Cumae by the Ephesians,¹¹ he turned inland and recruited an army of slaves and serfs, some Thracians¹² who were probably part of the former Pergamene army, and hillmen of the interior. He then took Thyateira and Apollonis, forced Pergamum to take measures for its defense if he did not actually occupy the city,¹³ besieged Smyrna,¹⁴ and defeated and killed the Roman consul Crassus Mucianus somewhere between Smyrna and Elaea.¹⁵ It is probable that his defeat by Perperna and his subsequent flight took place also in this region, and that he was caught in Stratoniceia on the Caicus as he retired toward the hills of Mysia Abbaitis which were left for the succeeding governor Aquilius to subdue.¹⁶

Radet favored Stratoniceia of Caria on the ground that Aristonicus fled to

³ *Revue des études anciennes*, 1904, p. 161.

⁴ *Saggi di storia antica e di archeologia offerti a Giulio Beloch*, pp. 269 ff.

⁵ *Rev. ét. anc.*, 1919, pp. 2 ff.

⁶ Florus i. 35. 4 (2. 20).

⁸ *OGIS*, No. 339, ll. 53 ff.

⁷ Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte* (1908), pp. 68 ff.

⁹ *IGRR*, IV, 134.

¹⁰ Holleaux, *op. cit.*, p. 2, ll. 13-14.

¹¹ The story of the war is given in Strabo xiv. 1. 38.

¹² Val. Max. iii. 2. 12; Frontinus *Strat.* iv. 5. 16.

¹³ *IGRR*, IV, 289; 292, ll. 10 ff.

¹⁴ Ael. Aristides, ed. Dindorf, i. 766.

¹⁵ Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Val. Max. *loc. cit.*; Front. *Strat.* iv. 5. 16; Aul. Gell. *N.A.* i. 13. 12.

¹⁶ Holleaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 2 ff.

the city¹⁷ of Stratoniceia, for the Lydian one was only a village until it was raised to the status of a city by Hadrian.¹⁸ It had, however, been a city under the Pergamene kings and was after 186 B.C. the site of a cistophoric mint.¹⁹ The most probable explanation of its fall under the Roman régime is that the city was punished when Aristonicus was caught. Those who favor the Carian city must explain the fall of the Lydian one.

Consideration of the Carian city brings up another difficulty. The third fragment of the inscription of Bargylia²⁰ shows that in a quarrel with Rhodes, Stratoniceia was perfectly free to decide on any arbitrator it wished, and after considering an appeal to the Roman Senate agreed with Rhodes upon Bargylia instead. If it was thus autonomous so soon after the war, the inference is plain that it either had not resisted Rome or else had been treated with unusual clemency. Furthermore, in the senatorial decree which rewarded it for its resistance to Mithridates,²¹ a point repeatedly emphasized is its unbroken friendship, good will, and loyalty to the Roman people—a point hardly consistent if the city had been a refuge for an enemy within the memory of living men. The refuge of Aristonicus was not Stratoniceia of Caria but Stratoniceia on the Caicus.

T. R. S. BROUGHTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THE PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF ANTIGONUS GONATAS

The following passage of Seneca (*De ira* iii. 22. 4-23. 1) seems to have escaped notice:

Idem [Antigonus] tam miti animo hostium suorum male dicta quam civium tulit. Itaque cum in parvolo quodam castello Graeci ob siderentur et fiducia loci contemnentes hostem multa in *deformitatem* Antigoni iocarentur et nunc *staturam humilem*, nunc *colilsum nasum* deriderent; "Gaudeo," inquit, "et aliquid boni spero, si in castris meis Silenus habeo." Cum hos dieaces fame domuisset, captis sic usus est ut eos qui militiae utiles erant in cohortes discriberet, ceteros praeconi subiceret, idque se negavit facturum fuisse, nisi expediret is dominum habere qui tam malam haberent linguam.

23. Huius nepos fuit Alexander, qui lanceam in convivas suos torquebat, qui ex duobus amicis quos paulo ante rettuli [iii. 17. 1-2] alterum ferae obiecit, alterum sibi. . . .¹

¹⁷ Eutropius *loc. cit.*; Orosius *loc. cit.*

¹⁸ *IGRR*, IV, 1156; Radet, *Bull. corr. hell.*, 1887, pp. 108 ff. and 122.

¹⁹ Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 657; *Brit. Mus. Cat. of Coins*; *Lydia*, p. xvi, and Pl. 43, 1.

²⁰ Holleaux, *op. cit.*, p. 16; Foucart, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

²¹ *OGIS*, No. 441.

¹ This same incident occurs in an abbreviated variant in Plutarch *De cohibenda ira* 458 F.

Berve (*Das Alexanderreich*, II, 43, n. 1) implies that this Antigonus is Antigonus I Monophtalmus, but this is impossible, for Plutarch (*Demetrius* ii.) states that Demetrius Poliorcetes, though tall (*μέγας*), was not as tall as his father. This is incompatible with *staturam humilem*. There remain only Antigonus Gonatas and Antigonus Doson. Doson apparently does not figure at all in the popular philosophical literature of the Hellenistic period, while the position which Gonatas assumes in this literature is too well known to need mention.² The Antigonus in this passage is clearly Gonatas.

The extraordinary statement that Alexander the Great was the *nepos* of Antigonus is an interesting confusion on the part of Seneca, or his source, and further strengthens the conclusion that the Antigonus here mentioned is Gonatas, for Antigonus Gonatas had a nephew, the son of his half-brother Craterus, King Alexander of Corinth, and thus, taking *nepos* in its more general meaning of "descendant" (or perhaps rather in its secondary meaning as "nephew"), the origin of Seneca's error becomes apparent. The confusion of this minor ruler with the great king is easily understandable in a late author such as Seneca, whose interests were not historical but moralistic.

The point which emerges is that Antigonus Gonatas was short and snub-nosed. *Deformitatem* lends support to Tarn's suggestion (*CAH*, VII, 94) that "Gonatas," if Greek, may mean "knock-kneed." Antigonus' snub-nose may well be of numismatic significance, for the head of Pan on the tetradrachm of Antigonus Gonatas in the Münzkabinett of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin (reproduced as the frontispiece to Tarn's *Antigonos Gonatas*) possesses a decidedly *conlismus nasum*.

CHARLES F. EDSON, JR.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ON CATULLUS XLIV. 21

Qui tunc vocat me cum malum librum legi

Practically every editor who, with Lachmann, rightly reads *legi* and not *legit*, translates this line as "who only invites me whenever I read a villainous book" (Macnaghten & Ramsay). Thus Ellis has: "for inviting me . . . only when . . ."; Cornish: "for inviting me just when I have read a stupid book"; Morris: "who bids me dine just as I've read a book malign"; Kroll gives as a possible meaning "der mich einlädt, nachdem ich eine schlechte Rede von ihm gelesen habe"; Stuttaford has: "who only invites me when I have read some

² Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, pp. 247-56 and notes; W. Fellman, *Antigonos Gonatas* (dissertation; Würzburg, 1930), pp. 26-34 and notes. The importance of Antigonus Gonatas in these philosophical writings is well illustrated by another passage of Seneca (*De beneficiis* iii. 37. 3) where he replaces his father Demetrius I: "vicit Antigonus, qui, cum ingenti proelio superasset hostem, praemium bellum ad patrem transtulit et imperium illi Cypri tradidit; hoc est regnum nolle regnare, cum possis." Antigonus has here ousted his father as the victor of Salamis.

execrable book like this"; while Macmillan supports the somewhat feeble suggestion that Sestius may have asked Catullus to read the speech over before coming to dinner.

What are the circumstances? Assuming that Lachmann's *legi* is correct, as it surely is, we have the following occurrences. Sestius invited Catullus to dinner; while there, Catullus read Sestius' speech against Antius; it was *frigida*; he caught a chill. He has now recovered, but if ever he is so foolish as to read Sestius' works again, he is willing that a catarrh should descend on—Sestius; *qui tunc vocat me cum malum librum legi*, "who invited me on the occasion when I read his pestilential book."

Surely this is the natural conclusion; surely it is the simple and straightforward ending compared with the pointless and tortuous "who only invites me whenever I read a villainous book."

All that is needed is to take *vocat* as equivalent to *vocavit*, aorist.

The following considerations may be urged:

1. Lucretius i. 70 has *inritat* = *inritavit* and similarly *disturbat* for *disturbavit* (vi. 587) and *superat* for *superavit* (v. 396).

2. Lachmann pointed out that contracted perfects of this kind were used in three different ways: (a) Phaedrus, Seneca, and Silius admit them only before consonants or at the end of a verse; (b) Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, Martial, and the majority of the classical Latin poets, only before a vowel; (c) the old comic poets, either before a vowel or before a consonant.

Now Ellis has sufficiently shewn that Catullus' language in this part of his work approximates to the vulgar speech, and has many parallels in the extant comedies. Hence there is no reason to maintain that *vocat* cannot be a perfect on the ground that it is followed by a consonant.

3. Schanz (*Lat. Gram.*¹, I, § 244) has pointed out that in inscriptions the first conjugation *-avil* is frequently contracted in vulgar speech to *-ait* or *-aut*; and thence a transition to *-at* would be a simple matter.

Linguistically, therefore, it would not seem impossible to take *vocat* in Catullus xlii. 21 as equal to *vocavit*; and the gain to the good sense of the passage would be great.

T. J. HAARHOFF

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

BOOK REVIEWS

The Heroic Age of Science. By WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co. for the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1933. Pp. vii + 203. \$2.50.

Professor Heidel's book is an interesting and valuable contribution to the history of Greek science. Its value is enhanced by the fact that a good many questions are raised that cannot be answered with ease and certainty. Part I contains a discussion of the "Conception and Ideals of Science among the Greeks"; in Part II the material on the methods of Greek science is arranged under the headings "Observation and Induction," "Classification," "Analogy," and "Experimentation."

Professor Heidel plunges at once into the difficulties involved in the mutual relations of magic, religion, science, and philosophy. He seems (p. 15) to follow the lead of Hegel and Frazer in representing magic as a kind of primitive science, founded upon elementary axioms such as "like produces like," a special case of which is the genetic definition: "If the savage wants rain, he may either produce a mimic rain-fall or tell how rain was originally produced." There is, however, no rectilinear ascent from magic to science. When we compare the mental attitude of the user of magic with that of the scientist, it is clear that the one desires to act upon the world without taking the trouble to measure and to calculate, and that the growth of science is not the refinement of rudimentary magical notions, but is directly due to a voluntary effort which is a complete contrast to the laziness of magic. For the same reason, the genetic definition may easily develop into science, or history, or philosophy, but the use of a genetic myth for magical purposes is not at the root of such development.

After some excellent remarks on nature and law and Greek medical enlightenment (the Hippocratic theory of epilepsy), Professor Heidel records his "fundamental conviction" that "Greek science was from the first one . . . and that there is a striking unity in the view of the world held by the Greeks from beginning to end" (p. 31). This is of course true, in a way, and yet there are dangers in seeking to cover a long period of history with a blanket formula. For example, on the next page he tells us that "Christian theology, which took form under Greek influences, has remained essentially unchanged." But the fact is that Christian theology has changed a good deal, to all outward appearances, and these changes are not canceled or accounted for by insisting on an eternal and immobile essence that may be thought of as underlying them. Another generalization (p. 33) runs on similar lines:

Greek thought was characterized by a healthy union of realism with idealism. It accepted the world, but with reservations—that is to say, it never seriously doubted the reality of things, but it felt from the first that they called for scrutiny and interpretation. . . . The earliest Greek thinkers lived on the plane of science, but gradually the insistent demand for interpretation led their successors to assumptions distinctly metaphysical. . . . Only when Socrates turned with conviction from the study of the external world to the contemplation of ideals, and recognized in them the things most important and consonant with human nature, did metaphysical problems clamor for clear statement and solution. In a real sense philosophy, as distinguished from science, begins there.

Philosophy and metaphysics are thus assimilated to a demand for interpretation of the facts about the external world, and to the search for final causes; Professor Heidel accepts, with some slight reservations, the Aristotelian analysis of the history of Greek thought.

It may be worth while to point out that the questions raised by this acceptance of Aristotle are not mere questions of definition; they are given a definite weight and content by being partly identified with Aristotle's view of history. I say partly identified, because there is an extremely significant change in the comparative ranking awarded to those "who first philosophized about nature" by Aristotle and by Professor Heidel. When Aristotle says that most of his predecessors busied themselves with the material principle and the material cause, he is really condemning them for their almost complete ignorance of his other three causes; when Professor Heidel says that the earliest Greek thinkers "lived on the plane of science," he probably means to eulogize rather than to condemn. In any case, the testimony of Aristotle is thus used to support the theory that these early Greeks were scientists and not philosophers, and the corollary that Socrates was the first real philosopher. Philosophy becomes a "metaphysical" activity that deals with the "supersensuous" world, while science deals with the world of practical experience and with matter. But this generalization, if we accept it, promptly gets us into trouble with the facts. Scientists are capable of insisting that the world of matter is the ultimate reality; they then appear to be philosophizing. We need definitions, and we need a theory of the relation between science and philosophy, which will be sufficiently flexible to account for both the ancient and the modern confusion of the two activities, and for their frequent appearance in the same person. Aristotle was both a scientist and a philosopher; and it seems quite possible that Thales and Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Parmenides, were both scientists and philosophers. Many of the statements that Aristotle makes about his predecessors are colored by a prejudice and a conceit that are only half hidden by his formal and weighty style, and his picture of the evolution of thought about the four causes is really a hymn to his own achievement rather than an acceptable basis for history.

Part II contains a vast amount of interesting material on the methods of Greek science. As Professor Heidel says (p. 88), the task of selecting illustra-

tions of Greek procedure is difficult, but despite his modest disclaimer he has carried it out in such a way as to deserve only favorable criticism. One or two small suggestions might be made. Professor Heidel mentions the "influence of court-procedure in developing the technique for the finding and testing of truth" (p. 86); I cannot help feeling that court-procedure and the law of legal evidence have been hindrances to the finding of truth both in ancient and in modern times. In the discussion of induction and the empirical method, it is said that Epicurus was "well aware of the principle of the plurality of causes" (p. 110). It may be worth noting that Epicurus insisted upon this principle in reference to celestial phenomena, and for motives that were far from scientific. This is especially clear in the *Epistle to Pythocles* 97 (Bailey's version): "And do not let the divine nature be introduced at any point into these considerations, but let it be preserved free from burdensome duties and in entire blessedness. For if this principle is not observed, the whole discussion of causes in celestial phenomena is in vain, as it has already been for certain persons who have not clung to the method of possible explanations, but have fallen back on the useless course of thinking that things could only happen in one way. . . ." The plurality of causes is invoked, here and elsewhere (*Epistle to Herodotus* 77), as a refuge from theistic determinism.

There are few misprints (I have noted only pp. 54, 72, 100) and a brief Index. It is to be hoped that Professor Heidel will not let his doubt whether the time has arrived for undertaking a history of Greek science hinder him from writing more books on the subject. He is already well placed in the honorable line that includes Tannery, Milhaud, Cantor, Zeuthen, Loria, Mieli, and Heath.

R. K. HACK

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Geld und Wirtschaft im Römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr. By GUNNAR MICKWITZ. (Societas Scientiarum Fennicae—*Commentationes humanarum litterarum*, IV, No. 2.) Helsingfors: Akadamische Buchhandlung; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932. 8°. Pp. xv+238. Finnish M. 170.

Professor Mickwitz has written an excellent book on the economic history of the fourth century A.D., laying special stress on the significance of the monetary problem in that period. He re-examines the famous economic theories which were set forth in 1864-65 by Bruno Hildenbrand and Rodbertus and which were later followed, with various modifications, by Bücher, Ed. Meyer, and M. Rostovtzeff. The main idea of these theories is that the characteristic trait of the economic structure of the Roman Empire in the fourth century A.D. was household economy. Basing his careful study on vast material, especially numismatic and papyrologic, and taking into consideration the recent

works of Dopsch and Pirenne on the economic history of the early Middle Ages, Mickwitz comes to the conclusion that the dogma of household economy or natural economy (*Naturalwirtschaft*) as a predominant factor in the fourth century can no longer be justified. He shows that parallel with household economy money was also in use in business transactions. The sources testify that in the fourth century there was no radical change (*Umwälzung*) of economic relations; there was no break with the past; as a whole the economic organization of the fourth century remained the same as in the earlier imperial time. Money continued in use, and Mickwitz devotes most of his study to the monetary problems. He gives a very clear picture of the history of coinage up to the fourth century, beginning with the time of Nero, surveys Aurelian's monetary reform and the peculiarities of the monetary problem in Egypt, of which certain points are strikingly elucidated by papyri, and passes to Diocletian's reforms. According to Mickwitz, Diocletian's regulation of gold coinage must be considered his greatest achievement in settling (of course only to a certain extent) the monetary difficulties of his period (p. 65). Diocletian's second innovation was the introduction of good silver coin. Accordingly, the monetary reforms which were carried out by Diocletian and after him by Constantine led to a relative financial improvement in the Empire; at least the currency depreciation in this period is in no way to be compared with that caused by the great inflation of the third century A.D. Owing to Diocletian's reforms, the Egyptian monetary system became more closely related to the imperial coinage, though it was not entirely assimilated. Mickwitz makes the interesting remark that in the beginning of the fourth century inflation was continuing in Egypt while outside this country it was decreasing (p. 105).

In this study, especially in reference to individuals, Mickwitz uses material from the sermons of the Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Church Fathers have not yet been adequately used for the economic history of the fourth century; and Mickwitz has confined himself almost exclusively to the sermons of the period. In my opinion our richest literary legacy from the Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries still awaits an investigator to reveal its fundamental importance for the economic history of the Roman Empire. Mickwitz points out that while the state continued to practice natural economy, money economy prevailed in private life.

The appearance of a natural economic financial system in a society which was organized on the basis of money economy is a remarkable phenomenon. But in the Roman Empire this may find its explanation in social relations. The household economy of the State benefited State employees [*Staatsdiener*], i.e., the army and bureaucracy, and at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth they are indisputably the most powerful classes in the Empire [p. 190].

It is impossible to deal in this brief review with all the questions discussed in Mickwitz' study; they are too many and too complicated. To perform

this task one must almost unavoidably study all his sources. I am sure that some of his results or suggestions are debatable and may at some later time be changed or modified. But as a whole Mickwitz' book is an extremely important foundation for the economic history of the fourth century A.D.

Our own experiences during recent years in the financial history of various countries, which have passed or are still passing through the fatal process of inflation and depreciation of currency, render Mickwitz' study very close to our own epoch and help us better to understand the tremendous financial and economic difficulties of the Roman Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

A. VASILIEV

NEW YORK CITY

Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. By CARL DARLING BUCK.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933. 6"×9". Pp. xvi+405. \$5.00.

Clear, concise, conservative—these are the chief qualities of Professor Buck's new book. No one will object to clarity and conciseness, or to conservatism when it is a judicious conservatism, as Buck's nearly always is. Nearly, but not quite. His orthodoxy now and again leaves the reader all but uninformed of recent theory and practice. In a book meant for students (and this is an uncommonly good one for them, already in use in my own classes) it is not desirable to adopt without comment the latest idea, and full discussion of new ideas would often have destroyed the proper proportion of the whole book. Besides, Buck has given references (pp. 367 ff.) to the more important literature dealing with controversial subjects, and with views which he does not himself accept. Nevertheless it is unfortunate that the student using this book must be warned against the utterly incredible long sonant nasals and liquids (which fail entirely to account for Greek -άμα-, -άνα-, -άρα-, -άλα-, not to mention other languages), and against the very improbable "pure velars" and "voiced aspirates" of the Brugmann tradition. It is doubtful too whether a really keen student will be content with Buck's exposition of I.Eu. ablaut—it will leave him asking many questions. If a younger teacher may be allowed to say so, there are one or two flaws, pedagogically speaking, which are quite serious. The abbreviation "etc." is very liberally sprinkled over Professor Buck's pages, often several times on a single page. This is all very well in lecture notes; the lecturer fills in the gaps. And we all know that with Professor Buck his "etc." is a symbol of profound knowledge. But in a students' textbook all too easily it produces by its example a slipshod habit of expression, masquerading as knowledge, and even becomes when repeated by the student a bottomless perjury. So too "of course"; to the challenge of Professor Buck's occasional use of this phrase the alert student will answer "Prove it." The remaining suggestions which present themselves to me after

a very careful reading of the book are these: now and again the symbols used in restored forms, though clear and intelligible, and sometimes the terminology employed, will make difficulties for students accustomed to other works;¹ the complete omission of syntax is difficult to justify—morphology is at once more interesting and more useful when yoked to syntax, where not infrequently it illuminates usage (e.g., the sociative case in Greek, or the undeclined future "participle" in *-urum* without *esse* in old Latin); there is no mention of consonantal alternation in I.Eu., where at least the alternation of breathed and voiced plosives is significant for Greek and Latin, nor of the important and not rare alternation seen in *στέγος*: *τέγος*, for any account of which the reader will search this book in vain; Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms might well have been printed with accents throughout, and should have been so printed in the discussion of ablaut (pp. 161 ff.), where they are essential; and a more liberal citation of English forms would have been well worth while.

These criticisms are not adverse. It will be seen that Buck's book is not one of those dull volumes which try to crowd in everything. There is a great deal of scope left for the keen student and enterprising teacher. To the latter, indeed, the book is a boon. Instead of spending most of his time writing forms on a blackboard for his students to copy, he can now (*experto crede*) put this book into their hands and then use the time in the class-room in discussion, always seeing to it that the students master day by day the appropriate subject matter for each meeting of the class. Misprints are trifling in character, though totaling over threescore on a strict count. There is a good, but not complete, Index of Greek and Latin words.

In nearly every respect this grammar is far superior to its only rival (Meillet and Vendryes). Professor Buck's own studies have contributed to the welcome variety and fulness of examples given in the account of the formation of non-stems, to the remarks on Latin orthography (especially compounds), and above all to the discussion of meaning. This last is an incomparable *multum in parvo*. Professor Buck never goes farther than the facts warrant; everywhere he is cautious in statement and never wastes a word. His book is certain of the warmest welcome from every teacher of Greek and Latin and richly deserves it. It will do much to encourage the study of the historical grammar of the two classical languages and to enlighten those ignorant persons who claim to teach the classics without themselves knowing anything of the history of the languages.

It is hoped that the comments which follow may indicate some of the many fascinating bypaths which the thoughtful student using this book will be tempted to explore further for himself.

Page 5. The relation of Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, especially *r:l*.

¹ The use of "to" in many senses of Ger. *zu* is not English. But it may be personal prejudice which objects to "dialectic," "interchange," and "parent speech" (the last a common, but not strictly justified, indeed a misleading metaphor).

15. How far does Tocharish show the "centum" treatment of labiovelars? Is the term "Indo-Hittite" (rather than "proto-Indo-European") legitimate?

20. What exactly was the nature of the *κουνή*?

21. How far, if at all, did the pronunciation of *πράττω* differ from that of *πράσσω*?

37. Was not the authoress of the *Peregrinatio* really called Egeria (see *Lib. Gloss.* CE 377-79)?

45. What part did popular etymology play in Greek and Latin?

49. Is French *aller* really derived from *ambulare*?

52. Is not "rubber" (and even "indiarubber") still "eraser," at least in England?

54. Does the etymology of *causa* support this account of the development of its meaning?

60. (cf. 258, 264). What is the force of *-sc-* in Latin verbs? Is it not rather "progressive" (i.e., indicating action that takes place in stages) than "inchoative"? He who only begins to grow (*crescit*) will remain an infant.

68. Why was the old view (here rightly abandoned), that the Latin alphabet came directly from the Greek, wrong?

81. Why *u* in *tinguo: τέγγω*? Is not the spelling *tingo* justified?

98. Explain *ἀστήρ* beside *stella*, "star."

104. (cf. 322, 327). How can *γ, λ, η, ς* be pronounced before vowels?

121. Explain *v* in English *seven: septem*.

144. How does *ct* in *vectus* represent *h+t*?

171. Is not the statement that the gen. and abl. sg., except in *o*-stems, had the same form, ambiguous? How far is the vocative a true "case"?

173. Does not *-eī* better explain both *-ai* and *-eī* as dative?

174, 178 (cf. 340). Explain *materia* (*:materies*), *sapientia* and like forms.

178. Why did analogy operate to change *-um* to *-orum* only in *o*-stems?

180. From what stage of Old Irish is *maqi* quoted?

181. Is it true that only in Latin and Keltic the gen. sg. of *o*-stems shows *-i?*

193. Add (and explain) Gothic *anstais*. What about *i*-stems (as distinguished from *l*-stems)?

197. How well attested is the nom. sg. *όδούς*?

237. Why does language need a passive voice?

291 (cf. 294). Is it strictly true that perfects in *-y-* are specifically Latin?

306. Is the passive *iri* so very remarkable in view of the multipersonal *itūr*, "folks go"?

309. Is not *volvenda dies* rather passive ("time as it is being rolled on")?

321. How are the Greek names of months to be classified?

324. What is the relationship between *fortu-* in *fortuito* and *fortu-* in *fortuna*?

325. But does *soror* contain (as is here implied) *-ter-*, *-tor-*?

Sic vos, non vobis, mellificatis, apes!

J. WHATMOUGH

The Sounds of Latin. By ROLAND G. KENT. (Language Monograph XII, Supplement to *Language*, September, 1932.)

Books, like men, have the defects of their virtues, and Professor Kent's monograph is no exception to the rule. On page 135 we read that I.Eu. *m.* became Italic *f* before *r*. There are two shortcomings in this statement. First compare Buck's statement (*Comp. Gram.*, p. 148) that *mr* initially becomes *br*. Both Kent and Buck cite one example each of initial *mr*: in Buck, *brevis*: $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\beta\varsigma$, Av. *mārəzv-*; in Kent, *fremō:βρέμω*, *murmurō*, Skt. *marmara-*. Whatever the true explanation may be (cf. Stolz-Leumann, pp. 139 f.), it is evident that neither statement is enough. But Buck at least names a group *mr*- as changing into another group, at least he does not thrust so utterly into the background the phonetic process and operate merely with formulas. Almost the whole of Kent's phonology shows this defect, precisely because it is very correct, very cautious, very careful, and very proper, formal to a fault. In the hands of a teacher so inspiring as Professor Kent, his compact compilation must be extremely valuable as an instrument of instruction; otherwise it will make tedious reading. A very useful feature is the addition of exercises for revision, with references to the appropriate sections for study.

It should not be supposed, however, that Professor Kent is not interested in the actual pronunciation of Latin in the different stages of its history. There is a long chapter on pronunciation, and Professor Kent is confident (p. 44) that he could make himself intelligible to a Cicero *redivivus*. But some of his descriptions will not be intelligible to an uninstructed beginner. On page 45 we read that Latin *ō* was pronounced "somewhat as in Eng. . . . boat (if without the diphthongal vanish)." Correct, but what a way of putting it! And on the same page the sound of Latin *ā* is said to be that of "a in English *ask*, if it be pronounced properly." Pronounced properly by whom? In Pennsylvania or in Boston? In standard southern English or north of the Trent? I know what Professor Kent means; but he does not say what he means, and his description is accordingly defective.

There is a curious mixture of the elementary and the original, of the old-fashioned and of the novel. We are told not only the rules of prosody and of syllabic division that every schoolboy knows, but also Professor Kent's not unattractive explanation of the long vowel in forms like *āctus*. Within an account of ablaut that is in general up to date there linger long sonant nasals and liquids qualified only by the phrase "if really existent." There is very little, however, that a careful reading reveals as actually wrong. It is not true to say without exception (p. 62) that Gothic borrowings with *w* for Latin *v* were made "in the fourth and fifth Christian centuries or later." Gothic *alēw* is a much older borrowing; for it shows the pro-ethnic Germanic change of *ō* to *ā*. To Greekless students, and more especially to students of Romance philology who wish to acquire what most of their brethren usually lack—a

knowledge of the history of Latin before the vulgar Latin period—Professor Kent's book is to be cordially recommended as, with hardly an exception, a trustworthy guide.

J. WHATMOUGH

HARVARD COLLEGE

An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by TENNEY FRANK in collaboration with T. R. S. BROUGHTON, R. G. COLLINGWOOD, A. GRENIER, R. M. HAYWOOD, A. C. JOHNSON, J. A. O. LARSEN, R. S. ROGERS, V. M. SCRAMUZZA, and J. J. VAN NOSTRAND. Vol. I: *Rome and Italy of the Republic.* By TENNEY FRANK. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xiv+431. \$3.00.

This work is designed to embrace the entire Roman world down to the middle of the fourth century B.C. The editor is to contribute those portions which are concerned with Italy, while his collaborators deal with the Empire outside the peninsula. It is expected that the work will consist of four volumes and will be completed by the end of 1935. The aim is to assemble the source material for the economic history of the Roman world, taking account of such archaeological evidence as is available. The utility of such a collection of source material is so obvious as to require little or no comment. Our information in this field is unfortunately very limited and is derived from widely scattered references, often incidental and casual. To bring all such references together and to arrange them so that they may be readily found and examined is a most valuable contribution to the study of Roman history in all its phases. If one may judge by the first volume and by the names of the contributors, the work will be admirably done and will place all serious students under a very real obligation.

The first volume deals with Rome and Italy from the beginning of the Republic to 30 B.C. The period before the Punic Wars is naturally treated very briefly, occupying only 55 pages. Chapter ii deals with the First and Second Punic Wars (264–200 B.C.); chapter iii with the period of the Eastern Wars (200–150 B.C.); chapter iv with the Gracchan period (150–80 B.C.); chapter v with the period from Sulla to Augustus (80–30 B.C.). In each chapter the material is grouped in a number of sections whose titles are sufficiently indicative of their contents to make reference easy. All extracts from the sources are given both in the original and in translation and they are preceded and accompanied by such explanation and commentary as is necessary to make clear their significance. Not all the source material is reproduced for reasons of space, but there are full references to such passages as have been omitted. With this volume at hand the student should experience little difficulty in ascertaining what foundation there is for the statements in regard to

economic conditions which he may find in historical works or in examining for himself the economic background of political events and social changes. For example, in the ninth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Hugh Last advances a view of the corn law of C. Graechus which is in some points at variance with that usually held. Here a careful examination of all the available evidence is obviously called for, and the task is rendered comparatively easy by this work. It might have been made still easier, however, by a few cross-references. The editor has discussed the corn law in two places, first on page 192 in a section on prices between 200 and 150 B.C. and again on page 242 under "Economic Legislation, 133-80." On page 242 the statement is made that the price fixed by Graechus for the grain was "probably about half the normal price," but the evidence for this is not to be found in any of the references there given or in any of the passages there cited. Unless the reader looks back to the discussion of prices in the earlier period, the grounds on which the editor bases his assertion will remain obscure. Here, and in some other places, a reference to the previous discussion ought clearly to have been added, and the lack of such references seems to the reviewer the most serious defect in the book.

The problems raised by such a work are so many and so varied that any discussion of them within reasonable limits is impossible. In general, the editor has performed a difficult task with care and judgment. Most readers will probably find some points on which they are inclined to dissent from his interpretation of the evidence, but the evidence has been placed before them and they can weigh it for themselves. Whatever defects they may discover, they will remain deeply grateful to the editor whose labors have done so much to facilitate the investigation of the economic development of Rome and Italy under the Republic. This volume will certainly prove a work of the highest value and all who have examined it will wait eagerly for those that are to follow.

FRANK BURR MARSH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas. By CAMPBELL BONNER.

Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934. Pp. xi+137.

\$3.00.

Eleven years after the acquisition of the manuscript, Professor Campbell Bonner presents a complete transcription of the text of this famous papyrus (P. Mich. 129) in a splendid publication in the "Humanistic Series of the University of Michigan." The Introduction gives a detailed description of the manuscript, a sketch of its history, and an evaluation of its text. The author deserves the highest commendation for the thoroughness of his description, which is illuminated by five facsimile plates.

The transcription is accurate, and the work is remarkably free from typographical errors. However, on page 4 (of the papyrus), line 20, a rough breathing should be read above $\omega\nu$ (see Pl. I). The editor slanders the scribe when he accuses him of "utter irregularity" in the use of this rough breathing because he uses it with $\epsilon\nu$ s but not with the following $\epsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\oslash$. The scribe has very definite limits within which he employs the mark. He uses it for the relative pronoun and for words which have a twin which commonly occurs with the smooth breathing. Thus he uses it with $\epsilon\nu$ s, $\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\xi$, and $\alpha\nu\tau\eta$. His principle seems to have been to use it only where it was most needed, although he does not always use it even there.

The editor's conclusions as to the text are that P. Mich. 129 is closer to the early versions and the two earliest papyrus sources than it is to the Athos codex, and that there is no one manuscript that can be used as the sole basis for the text. These positions are supported in convincing fashion by the evidence supplied in the notes. Entirely sound is the editor's assertion that the conditions of the transmission of the Shepherd in the early period would not permit the production of a text that was accurate throughout. Recent study has clearly shown that this was true in the case of the New Testament; it was so much more true in the case of the Shepherd that Professor Bonner's careful study of the sources is not able to construct a satisfactory stemma. But he slips into one of the attractive fallacies of textual study when he posits the antiquity of "the A(thos) type" of text because of early evidence for several readings of the Athos manuscript. His own demonstration of the cohesion of the early witnesses against A and the Ethiopic, and the consistent testimony of the notes argue against such a generalization. And it is to be regretted that the discussion of the text is obscured with statistics, nowhere less significant than in textual study.

This volume valuably increases the source material available for a critical edition of the text of the Shepherd. The Michigan papyrus, written in the third century, contains most of the Similitudes between ii. 8 and ix. 5; the book originally began with Vision 5. Equally valuable are the notes, in which the textual evidence of all sources extant in this area is given. In addition to all this, Professor Bonner gives a complete transcription and discussion of another Michigan papyrus (P. Mich. 130), which contains a passage from the mandates of Hermas (ii. 6—iii. 1).

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Vol. I, 1932; Vol. II, Nos. 1-4, 1933. Harvard University Press.

\$3.00 per volume.

This new journal, richly illustrated and admirably made, is welcome not only for the contributions that it brings to archaeology, but also for its evi-

dence of increased American achievement. The German, French, and British schools at Athens have long had their own publications, but the papers written at the American School appeared, along with the rest of American archaeological production, in the *American Journal of Archaeology*. Now, with the altered format of the *AJA*, we have two periodicals, both larger and handsomer than the previous one; and the newcomer is not unworthy of comparison with its fellows of other nations.

Two articles by Broneer deal with his investigations on the north slope of the Acropolis. The exhaustive study of the Pnyx, by Mr. Kourouniotes and Homer K. Thompson, is published in an article which has already elicited a criticism by Dinsmoor, followed by a rejoinder from the authors. Sterling Dow studies the important inscription *IG*, II², 1706, a list of the boards of archons over a period of years; and he collaborates with Professor Ferguson in a new reading of the decree in honor of Theophrastos, *IG*, II², 1303. Miss Shoe publishes a group of antiquities confiscated from a resident of New Corinth; this is the only article in the two volumes that is not concerned with Athenian material.

The principal reason for the existence of the new periodical is found in the American excavations in the Agora. Their archaeological yield, except perhaps in inscriptions, has seemed to some observers disappointing, particularly when the expenditures and the size of the staff are considered. Topographical information, which might most confidently have been expected, has been particularly scant; but if recent newspapers can be trusted, the Tholos has now been found and further progress may be rapid. Through *Hesperia* the material is laid before the world of scholarship with gratifying promptness and, in some parts, with full scholarly discussion. Numbers 2 and 4 of Volume II are given over entirely to the Agora. One may note Miss Burr's study of a Proto-Attic deposit; a fine Greek gable figure of "Timothean" style; a new fragment of an inscription previously known, which is convincingly explained by Oliver as the rival epigrams composed by Simonides and Aeschylus in commemoration of Marathon; the careful treatment of the very numerous coins; and the praiseworthy attention to Roman and Byzantine pottery.

To many readers the most interesting papers to appear thus far in *Hesperia* are two by Professor Carpenter. In the first volume he identifies a fragmentary figure, which for years had stood unnoticed before the Acropolis Museum, as U of the west gable of the Parthenon. Drawn by Carrey, the figure thereafter disappeared from the knowledge of men, though, as now appears, not from their sight. Carpenter correctly recognizes also an imitation of it in a small pedimental figure found at Eleusis. In his desire to do the thing thoroughly, he is led to conclusions about other sculptures at Eleusis which are uncertain; but there is no doubt about the chief contribution, and it is a brilliant achievement.

In No. 1 of Volume II the author deals with the missing sculptures of the

central part of the east pediment. It is essentially the same discussion which, as a lecture, has fascinated numerous audiences, and Carpenter's persuasive eloquence loses little of its potency in print. Yet a glance at his sketched reconstruction, whether one finds it aesthetically satisfying or not, must awaken misgivings. A seated Zeus is placed in the center. One of the sculptor's problems was to keep the inevitable differences in the scale of his figures from being unduly conspicuous; by making a seated figure the tallest of all he would emphasize the difference; no other gable composition shows a single seated figure in the center. Athena is not only relatively small, but is at the back of the pediment, partly behind the footstool of Zeus: a modest figure indeed, considering that the Parthenon is her temple. A seated Apollo is postulated, with an advanced foot resting on a separate plinth; no satisfactory analogy for this is presented; the best that can be said is that it is not physically impossible. The whole arrangement is based on a study of the traces on the floor of the pediment, which Carpenter has carefully examined anew. It is impossible here to review his discussion in detail. The attentive reader will admire his ingenuity, but will not always be convinced. There are traces shown in the drawing—for example, in block 16—that are never mentioned. The idea that the broad iron bars were planned to support, in each instance, the edges or corners of two sculptures rather than the mass of one seems improbable.

Max Wegner first drew attention to a fragment, plinth and lower part, of a draped female figure lying on the Acropolis. It is now published independently by him, in *Ath. Mitt.*, 1932, pages 92–101, and by Carpenter. Carpenter argues that it belongs, as does another fragment from the upper part of a figure, to the original of the Lachesis on the celebrated Madrid puteal. This is difficult to maintain of Wegner's fragment, taken alone; and a moment's study of the drapery of the two fragments shows that they cannot possibly belong to one statue. Wegner has a different upper piece, and his combination, whether true or not, certainly gives a correct general idea of the figure to which the lower fragment belonged. If this figure belonged to the left half of the pediment, it must displace one of the three Fates which Carpenter takes from the puteal, and of course the other two Fates would go also. In the right half, Carpenter's plan calls for one draped standing figure besides the Athena; but the floor-marks show that the plinth for this figure was 0.73 m. deep, while the depth of the new fragment is only 0.50 m. The inevitable conclusion is: If this figure belongs to the gable at all, Carpenter's scheme is wrong in major features.

A number of hypotheses are incidentally advanced. According to one of them, the Themis of Chairestratos is slavishly copied from the Nemesis of Agorakritos, which stood throughout antiquity a few feet away. The Themis is backward-looking sculpture, but there is no valid evidence for accusing Chairestratos of this extraordinary folly. In certain other matters one is not

convinced. Yet it should be emphasized that Carpenter's keenness and subtlety are always in evidence; and his views, arising from independent examination of the material, cannot be neglected by later investigators.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Aus Roms Zeitwende: Von Wesen und Wirken des Augusteischen Geistes. Beiträge von OTTO IMMISCH, WALTHER KOLBE, WOLFGANG SCHADEWALDT, und HANNS HEISS. Leipzig, 1931.

This book contains the text of four very interesting lectures, two of which are concerned with the policies of Augustus, two with Vergil. Immisch's lecture, "Zum antiken Herrscherkult," discusses with saneness and comprehension "the propaganda by which Mark Antony and Octavian sought to give religious sanction to their claims to supremacy." Immisch's conclusions about Antony's identification with Dionysus and Octavian's association with Apollo are not very different from Jeanmaire's (*Rev. arch.*, XIX [1924], 241-61). Antony as Dionysus is in the rôle of the Hellenistic divine monarch, and Octavian, not identified but associated with Apollo, a far more restrained god, is adopting a policy of opposition to extreme honors which accords with his opposing aims. Probably Immisch goes too far in refusing to assign to Augustus' lifetime the legend that Augustus was Apollo's son, and in attributing to the time of Tiberius and the temple of Divus Augustus the statute representing Augustus with Apollo's features which was said to have been set up by Augustus himself in the precinct of Apollo on the Palatine. The authority for the story, the Pseudo-Acro scholiast on Horace, may be a poor one, but it would be more reasonable to reject it entirely than to assign it to another period and another temple. In seeking the explanation of Augustus' choice of Apollo as his god, Immisch rightly rejects the usual explanation—that Vediovis, the patron god of the Julii, was a form of Apollo. In his discussion of Augustus as Mercury, Immisch has failed to realize that the Geneva bowl with the curious inscription "Octavius Caesar" is now generally recognized as a forgery.

Kolbe's admirable lecture, "Von der Republik zur Monarchie," discusses once more the significance of Augustus' constitutional reforms. In the provisions of the year 27 he sees republican precedents, particularly in Pompey's position as consul and proconsul in 52. It is in the provisions of 23 that he sees the beginning of Augustus' development of a limited monarchy. The chief indication of that character is in the lack of collegiality in the new form which the *tribunicia potestas* took. There are some interesting comments on the share which the Senate continued to have in foreign affairs. A curious misconception of the powers of the American Senate is revealed by the statement on page 50 that the Constitution of the United States "überlässt das auswärtige

Ressort ganz dem Präsidenten." In evolving the peculiar forms of his constitution Kolbe thinks that Augustus was perhaps influenced less by Cicero than by Plato.

The two lectures on Vergil, given to celebrate the Vergilian bimillennium, emphasize the neglect of Vergil which has long been apparent in Germany. Schadewaldt's "Sinn und Werden der vergilischen Dichtung" is written with historical perspective and appreciation. In the account of the development of the poet it is hard to see why none of the minor poems except the *Catalepton* is considered. Heiss's "Vergils Fortleben in den romanischen Literaturen" considers especially the influence of Vergil on Dante, Camões, and Victor Hugo. On Dante he naturally has little that is fresh to say, but on the Portuguese poet and on Victor Hugo he writes vividly and delightfully.

LILY ROSS TAYLOR

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Virgil the Necromancer—Studies in Virgilian Legends. By JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO. ("Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature," Vol. X.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. 502. \$5.00.

Virgil's rôle as a magician in the Middle Ages is of course a matter of interest for the study of folklore rather than of the classics and their influence. In many of the folk tales the central figure bears the name of the great poet but has no other association with him. Yet it would be unfair to say that these tales are entirely without classical interest.

Spargo's book naturally calls to mind Comparetti's *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, which it does not entirely supplant for the classicist. Spargo's book corresponds to the second part of Comparetti's and reveals the advance made in folklore studies since Comparetti wrote.

In his first chapter, Spargo surveys briefly the whole period of the legends, from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. They are found first in John of Salisbury. Those writers who had the most influence in spreading the stories were Neckam, Gervasius of Tilbury, Vincent of Beauvais, the author of the *Image du monde*, and Enikel.

Succeeding chapters take up the details of the legends and attempt to trace them to their sources. First comes the story of the bronze fly which Virgil manufactured to drive the flies from Naples. Spargo thinks that this may have been the first Virgilian legend. Here as elsewhere Spargo surveys the various suggestions that have been made to account for the origin of the story. In dealing with the egg talisman which protected the Castello dell'Ovo at Naples, Spargo points out that an early version of the story appears in the thirteenth century whereas the name of the castle is not found before 1352.

But one of the few references which Spargo overlooked in his excellent bibliographical apparatus proves that the name was used in 1335-36 and again in 1337.¹ The presumption is therefore that it was used officially still earlier and may have had some popular vogue even in the thirteenth century. Spargo thinks that the egg story is of Mohammedan origin.

For the stories of moving statues and other automata Spargo makes the attractive suggestion that they are based on Hero of Alexandria, as transmitted perhaps by Arabic sources. The most famous of the Virgil stories, that of the lover suspended in a basket, is said to be partly of oriental, partly of Germanic origin. It has been used in recent years by Bulwer-Lytton in *Pelham*, Richard Strauss in his opera *Feuersnot*, and Anatole France in *L'île des pingouins*.

Spargo seems to me a little too positive in rejecting Comparetti's view that some of the Virgilian stories are based on local stories about Virgil's tomb. For one thing he misinterprets Benecke's infelicitous translation of Comparetti's *ricordi locali* as "local records" and states that he was unable to find any such records of Virgil's tomb at Naples. All that Comparetti meant was that the Virgil legend was a popular product, based on local *tradition* (not *records*), on the long stay of Virgil in Naples and the presence of his tomb there. If a particular Virgil legend could have persisted in oral tradition in Metz from the thirteenth to the nineteenth century without leaving a trace in any written form, as Spargo suggests, if ancient Roman cults form a background for the *bocca della verità* tales of the later Middle Ages, why could not Neapolitan tradition have perpetuated legends about Virgil's tomb? Add to such a legend some acquaintance with Virgil's works and with Donatus' life, and a beginning is made. Even if we grant that Donatus' *ossa* refers to ashes, not bones, a mediaeval reader would think of bones.

In any case a number of allusions to the literary Virgil became attached to the legends about the magician. Such are the mention of the virgin birth (based on Christian interpretation of the fourth *Eclogue*) in Neckam and elsewhere, the introduction of Octavian in Aliprandi's tale, etc. Possibly the gates of good and bad fortune at Naples may have some connection with Virgil's gates of sleep in the sixth *Aeneid*.

A chapter on the legend in art is well illustrated. The book as a whole is a scholarly and valuable contribution to the history of the Virgilian legend.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Corolla archaeologica principi hereditario regni Sueciae Gustavo Adolpho dedicata. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup; London: Humphrey Milford, 1932. Pp. 276.

This publication of the young Swedish Institute at Rome is a great credit to its founder, Prince Gustavus Adolphus, and its director, Axel Boethius.

¹ F. di Martino Fusco, "Il Castello dell' 'Ovo,'" *Mouseion*, II (1924-25), 193.

The twenty contributors include such scholars as Boethius, Danielsson, Nilsson, and Persson. The Latin title impartially covers nine articles in German, eight in English, two in Italian, one in French.

Wijkström discusses the Argentina temples in Rome. His identifications and dates are as follows: Mars, 138 B.C.; Hercules Custos, 90-80 B.C.; Lares Permarini, 179 B.C.; unknown, after Sulla. The adjacent portico is the *Porticus Minucia vetus*. This portico is discussed in detail in an article by Wall. Säfstrand explains the *Porta Mugonia* as the "Gate of Sighs," because through it funeral processions passed to the burial place on the Sacra Via. Boethius has an important article dealing with the development of the *insula* and the changes in building methods that came into vogue in the first and second centuries of our era. Fagerlind traces the development of the Corinthian column in Rome and shows thereby that Frank's dating of the columns of the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine is too late. Nilsson criticizes the views of Noack and Loewy on the origin of the triumphal arch and reiterates his view that it began as a pedestal for statuary.

In discussing the palace at Vouni in Cyprus, Gjerstad is led to a study of houses in all parts of the ancient world. The Etruscan atrium he thinks is Anatolian. Two other articles deal with Cyprian excavations. Persson's elucidation of the supposedly Greek inscription from Asine has been widely commented on. Seitz adds one more interpretation to the many dealing with the celebrated statue of the youth from Subiaco: it is Lycaon begging Achilles to spare him.

On the whole, we have here an unusually important group of articles, beautifully illustrated.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

"Symbolae Osloenses," Fascs. IX-XII; Fasc. Suppl. V-VI. Oslo: Brögger, 1930-33.

It is not possible to do more than to call attention to a few articles in this thriving series. In Fascicle IX Blegen and Wace have an article on "Middle Helladic Tombs." Skard examines again the question of Sallust's political views and follows Meyer in opposing the generally accepted belief that Sallust was a radical and a warm friend of Caesar. Sallust's ideal, according to Skard, was a strong senate. In Fascicle X Eitrem begins an important article on apotheosis. The discovery of a new fragment of Sophron leads the same author, in Fascicle XII, to examine the different ways in which Sophron and Theocritus handle a magical theme and also to discuss Horace's fifth and seventeenth epodes, which are concerned with Canidia. R. Ullmann concludes that in the early historiographers, Coelius and Sisenna, prose rhythm was only partially developed.

In supplementary Fascicle V Mörland deals at length with two Latin translations of Oribasius. He discusses the manuscripts and their relations, the

Greek manuscript used by the translators, date and place of translation, and especially the language, which has a strong colloquial flavor.

In the sixth supplementary fascicle Mörland publishes a short tract, "Rufus de podagra," translated from the Greek about 500-550 in or near Ravenna.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere bibliographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

Untersuchungen zu Catulls dichterischer Form. Von ILSE SCHNELLE. (Philologus, Supplementband XXV, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1933. Pp. 86.

The first chapter (previously published as a dissertation) provides an analysis of selected poems with brief and bewildering comment on style, metre, assonance—in fact, on everything that may contribute to an appreciation of the poet's varied means of artistic expression and of artistic structure. The next two chapters undertake to systematize and formulate the characteristic features of his style. Though much of the detail is helpful and highly suggestive, the presentation is labored and verbose, is marred by pompous diction and eccentric hyphenated compounds ("Dies Sich-den-subjectiven-Regungen Überlassen" [p. 52]), and breaks Catullus on the wheel of pedantry. The poet's "imperious lucidity" has not influenced the critic of his style.

H. W. P.

Collections de céramique grecque en Italie. By HUBERT PHILIPPART. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1932-33. Pp. 185, 19 pls., and 13 text figures. Fr. 12; Fr. 25.

The author states his object: to give for each of thirty-two Italian collections the necessary bibliography, a general idea of the contents, and a classified selection of pieces. Small and light, the two volumes could well be carried by traveling students. Others also will find them useful, though in parts the reader is given little more than an inventory, and the discussions are never elaborate. The writer's broad knowledge is evident and there are many references. Panathenaic amphoras and Italian red figure receive special attention. Many inscriptions are given in facsimile; one of them (I, 21) seems

to be an unpublished painter's signature. There are some illustrations of vases previously unpublished; one could have wished them better. Mr. Philippart is one of the few who cheerfully disagree with Professor Beazley.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

T. Macci Plauti Pseudolus. Edited . . . by EDGAR H. STURTEVANT in collaboration with FRANK E. BROWN, FREDERICK W. SCHAEFER, and JOHN P. SHOWERMAN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932. Pp. 122.

Intended for Freshmen at Yale, this edition lightens the student's labor by translating "hard words" and explaining the metre and forms of early Latin. Even the teacher may appreciate the meager commentary; it leaves him free to add so much from his own resources.

H. W. P.

Lexicon Plautinum, Voluminis secundi, fasciculus X: Video-Zonarius. Conscripsit GONZALEZ LODGE. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMXXXIII.

The completion of the final fascicle of Professor Lodge's *Lexicon* deserves a commemorative ode rather than a brief mention. After thirty years spent in the process of publication, and many in the collection of material, the compiler groans in his Latin Preface to this last instalment and modestly exclaims that now at last and too late he knows how a lexicon should be composed. Even if there may be a few errors which have escaped Professors Knapp and Lodge, the range of human weakness is much less in the cases of these two distinguished scholars than with most of us. The original plan of the work erred, if at all, in the amount and particularity of manuscript readings, but the thoroughness and accuracy which led the editor to do too much rather than too little is a constant boon to workers in the field. Every such worker has nothing but gratitude and congratulation to offer the composer for his long years of self-sacrificing labor.

H. W. P.

Die Ueberlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos. Von DR. CARL WENDEL. ("Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen," Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 1). Berlin, 1932. Pp. 124.

In spite of the unfavorable opinion concerning cyclic poems prevalent in Alexandria and the jibes of Callimachus, the *Argonautica* of Appollonius of

Rhodes did not fall into complete oblivion. There were several commentaries on the poem written in the first centuries of our era, most important of which were those of the grammarians Theo, Lucillus, and Sophocles. These three commentaries were put together by an unknown grammarian of the fifth century A.D. to form a sylloge which is the basis of all extant scholia of Apollonius. This sylloge, which suffered many revisions and alterations during the early Byzantine period, was represented in the Middle Ages by only one manuscript. But there must have existed also a complete text without scholia, and at the time of Photius these two manuscripts formed the basis of another, the archetype of all those that came down to us, the Laurentianus, the ancestor of G and S, and the lost original of the Paris recension.

The best representatives of the old sylloge today are the Laurentianus, XXXII, 9 and the prototype of the Paris recension. They are the ones—especially the first—upon which all modern editions must be based, and, in addition, much supplementary evidence can be gleaned from a study of the indirect transmission of the scholia.

We have here a conscientious and painstaking account of the transmission of the scholia to Apollonius' *Argonautica* consisting of the history of the different manuscripts and recensions and their relation to each other and a detailed discussion of the indirect sources of transmission. The work is ably and carefully done and may well serve as a model for similar future studies.

P. S. COSTAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by ALFRED GERCKE and EDUARD NORDEN. Band II, Heft 1: *Griechisches und römisches Privatleben*, by E. PERNICE (1930); Heft 2: *Münzkunde*, by K. REGLING (1930); Heft 3: *Griechische und römische Kunst*, by A. RUMPF (1931). Pp. 87, 37, 107. M. 3.24, 1.80, 4.32.

This standard work appears in its fourth edition without change in its general plan. The first two parts are largely the same as the corresponding parts of the third edition, but they are carefully brought up to date by their original authors. An important section of Pernice's work ceased being up to date immediately, since the houses in Olynthos are not considered. Less pardonably, the houses at Dystos remain in their customary obscurity.

Rumpf, successor to Winter of the third edition, writes an account of classical art which is not only entirely independent of Winter's work, but contains some interesting novelties. The term "Idaean" is introduced for the period 750-650, on the theory that the style of this period is primarily a Greek development with its center in Crete and that the oriental elements are only incidental. The capitals usually called "Aeolic" are here termed "Lesbian." It is to be hoped that nobody will adopt this name; to substitute one conventional name for another is to create confusion. In general, the treatment of

architecture is somewhat less happy than that of the other arts. The aberration about the Hermes is not accepted or even mentioned. The *Chiaramonti Niobid* unfortunately appears as an original. The *apoxyomenos* is assigned to Lysippos (rather than to his son) because of its resemblance to the Agias; that is absurd. The treatment of late Roman sculpture is unsatisfactory; the statue at Barletta, the outstanding masterpiece, is omitted altogether, and evidently not on chronological grounds. The bibliographies contain few non-German works, and are so arranged that books of a general character, if included at all, are likely to escape the reader. Usually the latest rather than the best treatments are cited; this is right for serious students. Apparently nothing of value on Lysippos has appeared since Loewy's *opusculum*; and Lawrence's *Later Greek Sculpture* is accorded no mention.

The treatise will be useful, particularly for German students. It could be made a safer guide, but perhaps only at the cost of diminished freshness.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Humanistic Value of Archaeology. By RHYS CARPENTER. ("Martin Classical Lectures," Vol. IV.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. 134.

This fourth volume of the "Martin Classical Lectures" is written with the charm and enthusiasm that we have come to associate with its author. Chapter i, on the archaeological approach, traces the history of archaeology and shows how the archaeologist of today differs from the pirate and plunderer whose descendant he is. One sometimes wonders whether the ancestral characteristics do not occasionally manifest themselves even today. Several examples are given to show archaeology's contribution to our knowledge of history. Chapter ii, on archaeology and Homer, is concerned with the "Phoenician mirage," the introduction of the Greek alphabet, and related questions. Here Carpenter is, it seems to me, largely in error, as I have endeavored to prove elsewhere. Therefore archaeology's contribution to literature is not satisfactorily defined. Chapter iii, on archaeology and art, deals chiefly with sculpture and shows the advance made in its study by attention to the technique of production and to the principles of its evolution. The last chapter, which gives its name to the volume, is the most significant and interesting. It gives a vivid account of scientific archaeology, with all its drudgery and monotony, comparing it with such descriptive sciences as botany and astronomy. It goes on to plead for a philosophic and humanistic archaeology, which aims to understand the facts which the science has collected. Particularly interesting are the speculations about the future of art.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Corpus vasorum antiquorum. U.S.A. Fascicule 2: Providence, Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design, Fascicule 1. By STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE. Pp. 42; 31 pls. U.S.A. Fascicule 3: University of Michigan, Fascicule 1. By WILHELMINA VAN INGEN. Pp. 84; 48 pls. Harvard University Press, 1933.

The steady progress of this great publication, inaugurated by Edmond Pottier, continues. One regrets the extraordinary fowl on the cover of the American fascicules, but it is not a serious blemish on the corpus. The Providence collection consists chiefly of Greek vases, though there are a dozen Egyptian pieces and one Mesopotamian. Peake and Fleure, *Peasants and Potters*, should be included in the bibliography of the Egyptian section; both their chronology and "sequence dates" are ignored. Some other omissions from the bibliographies are perhaps explicable by an interval between the completion and the publication; *Clara Rhodos* for Rhodian, Payne's article in *JHS*, 1926, for Cycladic. There is little fault to find with the text. The single specimen of Chalkidian is excellent; and among the thirteen Attic black-figure and 28 Attic red-figure pieces there are several of importance, notably the amphora signed by Nikosthenes, the Nolan amphora in which the helmet of the fallen warrior is seen from the rear, and the eponymous vase of the Providence Painter. There is also a fine head vase. The photographs are good and are supplemented by a few good drawings by Miss Banks and by a colored plate of a white lekythos.

The Michigan fascicule is unusual in that Greek painted vases occupy only a small part of it. Categories more fully represented are Egyptian, Cypriote, Greek and Italiote black-glaze, Arretine stamps, Campanian ware, and provincial Roman. Miss Van Ingen's text is satisfactory and has two indexes; again one notes some omissions in the bibliographies. The photographs are excellent. In some cases where vases were so restored that the old and the new parts were not easily distinguishable, light prints were made; the parts of the vase that had been restored were cut out from the light print and pasted on the normal print, which was then rephotographed. This is a fine idea.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Karanis: The Temples, Coin Hoards, Botanical and Zoölogical Reports, Seasons 1924-1931. Edited by ARTHUR E. R. BOAK. ("University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series," Vol. XXX.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Pp. 93; 37 pls., 16 plans, 4 diagrams. \$2.50.

This is the second volume of the report on the small Egyptian town, Karanis. The excavator's task was made more difficult by the previous re-

moval of earth for fertilizer, and much unquestionably was lost. It is evident that what was left was excavated in a thoroughly competent manner, and the report also is a very competent job. It is in the tradition of oriental, rather than classical, archaeology, in the very full illustration and the relatively succinct text; the coins, however, are not illustrated at all. Since the Greek inscriptions are reserved for future publication and the architecture is distinctly Egyptian, the volume is not primarily for the classicist; yet the interest of the coin hoards and of the altar of "Zeus Ammon Sarapis Helios" is considerable. The north temple is dated in the first or second century after Christ. The temple of Pnepheros and Petesouchos was dedicated in honor of Nero in A.D. 59-60, the inscription being preserved. The area had been occupied by buildings before, and was not abandoned until the fourth century.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Enigmas of Symphosius. By RAYMOND THEODORE OHL. (University of Pennsylvania Doctoral Dissertation.) Philadelphia, 1928. Pp. 137.

This dissertation is a very serviceable bearer of light to a field not often visited. The century of hexameter riddles, each a tristich, that passes under the name of Symphosius forms a section of the *Anthologia Latina*. This new edition of the riddles contains a well-composed Introduction on riddle-writing among the ancients, with special reference to Symphosius, a good bibliography, a fresh text (which attempts reasonably to escape the errors of both Riese and Baehrens), full *apparatus criticus*, English prose translation, extensive commentary, and an Index of Titles. Dr. Ohl has done his task with exemplary thoroughness; his work reveals the qualities of soundness and accuracy.

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

A Bibliographical Guide to Latium and Southern Etruria. By A. W. VAN BUREN. 3d ed. Rome: American Academy, 1933. Pp. 34.

A Companion to the Study of Pompeii and Herculaneum. By A. W. VAN BUREN. Rome: American Academy, 1933. Pp. 36.

These two pamphlets are an outgrowth of the trips on which Professor Van Buren takes his students. The first is purely bibliographical, with few comments, and deals with twenty-seven sites outside of Rome and three museums in Rome. The second in addition to bibliographical references quotes the texts of the ancient authors who mention the two towns, such as Pliny's two

letters on Vesuvius, etc. The pamphlets are useful for those who wish to know where to get the latest and most complete information on the subjects covered.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Velleius Paterculus. Edidit C. STEGMANN DE PRITZWALD. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933. M. 6.80.

This is a revision of Halm's edition of 1876. The manuscript problem is a simple one: no old manuscript has survived and we are dependent chiefly on the *editio princeps* of 1520. Under these circumstances the new edition hardly seems necessary since Bolaffi brought out a new edition in the Paravia series in 1930. A remark made by Stegmann that copies of the first edition reveal numerous differences suggests a line of investigation which might prove fruitful. One is reminded of the controversy stirred up by the variations in copies of the Aldine edition of Pliny's letters. Stegmann improves on Bolaffi by omitting reports on spelling from his apparatus.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece. By JOHANNES HASEBROEK. London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd. \$2.25.

This book was reviewed in the April issue of *Classical Philology*. Since then, the University of Chicago Press has acquired the exclusive agency for sales in the United States.

